

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXXVI, No. 17
WHOLE No. 906

February 5, 1927

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	391-394
EDITORIALS	
Pius XI, Mussolini, and the School—Your Grandmother and Senator Borah—The Government Takes Over the World—Our Federal Bootlegger—The Next Coal Strike—What Can We Arbitrate?	395-397
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Their Idea of God—The Gentle Art of Insult—Bolshevism in Mexico a Proven Fact—The Woman's Side of It, Continued—Are Protestants Americans?	398-406
POETRY	
Love's Young Dream—Colors of Life—Little by Little	399-400-406
EDUCATION	
The Catholic College and the College for Catholics	407-408
SOCIOLOGY	
An Appeal to the War Veterans	408-409
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF	409-410
LITERATURE	
The Passing of a Valiant Woman	410-412
REVIEWS	412-413
COMMUNICATIONS	414

Chronicle

Home News.—A State document of the utmost importance was issued on January 26 by Secretary Kellogg. It was a statement of American policy with regard to

Chinese Situation

China. This policy comprises the following principal heads: sympathy with Chinese nationalistic aspirations, support of Chinese demands for the abolition of extra-territoriality and for independence in imposing tariff duties, and, lastly, resistance to any move on the part of foreign Governments looking to the partition of that country. Mr. Kellogg made it clear that he is willing to negotiate new treaties with China at any time when a Government exists capable of speaking for the whole country. He also indirectly refused to take part in any military movement against the Cantonese when he stated that the presence of American warships in Chinese waters is for the sole purpose of protecting American lives and property, should that become necessary. Diplomatically, this document is a notice served on England and Japan that the United States is still in favor of the "open door" and against partition of the country. With reference to recent events in China, particularly the rise of the Nationalist Govern-

ment ruled from Canton, the following passage is significant:

The Government of the United States has watched with sympathetic interest the nationalist awakening of China and welcomes every advance made by the Chinese people toward reorganizing their system of government.

This document means, therefore, that the United States will play a "lone hand," and it is, besides, an open bid for friendship made to the Chinese themselves.

On January 25, the Senate, by a vote of 79-0, adopted the resolution of Senator Robinson, Democratic floor leader, declaring it the policy of the United States to settle questions at issue with Mexico by the process of arbitration. This resolution was hedged around by severe restrictions. It made it clear that it does not bind the President in his dealings with Calles. It calls for arbitration on the "principles of international law." It demands that, pending a solution, the Mexican Government do not inflict any damage on American lives or property. The unanimity of the vote is in a sense a tribute to a swiftly organized propaganda by a joint group of pacifists, internationalists and religious interests in sympathy with the policy of Calles. It was also fully stated at the time that it would heavily handicap the President in his foreign policy, as was evidenced in the refusal of Panama to ratify its treaty with us. Mr. Coolidge, however, had already made clear that the principle of private property was not subject to arbitration. Since this is the point at issue, and since Calles has also denied his intention of arbitrating this point, it was difficult to see how arbitration negotiations might be begun. At the same time, the question in Washington had degenerated into a political squabble, with an attempt being made to make political capital against the President. That attempt was foiled by the unanimity of the vote.

China.—Anti-foreign attacks continued but no damage of moment was reported. European Governments, however, manifested increased solicitude for their nationals, and both Madrid and Portugal ordered cruisers to the Yangtse district, while Great Britain took steps to reinforce her military contingent already there by an additional 12,000 troops. The Hunan Province and Foochow remained comparatively quiet, though at Amoy unfriendly agitation against the Spanish missionaries and nuns did not entirely subside. In general, the attitude of the Chinese toward the Christian religion and the labors

General Military Situation

of the missionaries is not unfriendly and the attacks upon them are chiefly incidental to the anti-foreign conflict, based fundamentally on political motives and the obvious incongruity of foreign concessionary and treaty privileges with the nationalist movement. There was a rumor that the Cantonese or National Government troops were forming in heavy force in Northern Chekiang Province, about 100 miles from Shanghai and that Marshal Sun Chuanfang was concentrating his opposition forces to repel their advance toward the capital. The rumor was unconfirmed, but the report was deemed significant as indicating the determination of the Cantonese to take Shanghai if possible before its foreign population was reinforced by the arrival of additional British troops, and also as foreshadowing where the next battle between North and South China might be fought.

France.—A shipment of \$20,000,000 in gold bullion from France was brought to New York on January 22 by the steamship *Rochambeau*, consigned to the American Exchange-Irving Trust Company. With the addition of a consignment ten days earlier, this made a total shipment of \$24,000,000. In many banking quarters a prediction was made that this export of gold indicated a return to the gold basis in the near future, a feat to be accomplished without the two factors hitherto considered essential—the debt settlement and the revaluation of the franc. The explanation was given that the gold represented the value in part of the gold pieces recently purchased by the Bank of France from the French populace at rates in paper francs based on the exchange rates. The Bank of France kept the coins, and sent the equivalent in ingots to New York, where it was sold to an American bank against liquid dollar securities.

Germany.—After the failure of Dr. Curtius to form a Cabinet, President Hindenburg invited ex-Chancellor Marx to see whether he could carry out the resolution passed by the Center calling for a Government composed of the Middle parties. These are the Centrists, the Democrats, the German and Bavarian People's parties. Such a Government would practically have been the same as that which had just been overthrown. The retention of Defense Minister Gessler was thus the paramount question, insofar as Socialist opposition to him had caused the previous crisis. President Hindenburg had objected to the ejection of Gessler on the ground that the defense of the Reich must not be made a subject of political disputes. When the efforts of Dr. Marx to create a Government of the Middle parties proved futile he was requested by President Hindenburg to form instead a Cabinet on "the basis of a majority of the middle-class parties." This implied cooperation with the Nationalists and the People's party. It was practically taken for granted that his commission would be carried out successfully, but there were many stumbling-blocks in the way. The Centrist leader definitely laid down the conditions to which

the Nationalists must subscribe in order to enter the Cabinet. These were recognition of the full legality of the Republic and defense of its Constitution and its flag; continuance of the conciliatory foreign policy of the preceding Governments, together with a genuine acceptance of the Locarno compact and cooperation with the League of Nations; reform of the Reichswehr along lines indicated by Dr. Marx, and absolute divorce from all anti-republican organizations; finally, ratification of the Washington eight-hour day as soon as it would meet the ratification of the Western European nations, and institution of unemployment insurance. These were difficult concessions for the Nationalist leaders to make, and so the formation of the Cabinet was long delayed. Meanwhile the Reichstag adjourned.

Great Britain.—Chinese disturbances continued to engage the chief attention of the Government. Formal and informal Cabinet meetings and conferences between the Ministry and various party leaders were daily occurrences. National anxiety, already high-pitched, increased when the Government announced that it was sending additional marines to Chinese waters and that within the week 11,000 infantrymen were expected to embark. Major Gen. John Duncan, assigned to command the land forces, sailed for the Far East aboard the transport *Megantic* on January 25. At the same time, the Government made it clear to the public that it would initiate no military engagement, though it would not permit any invasion of the Shanghai British concessions such as had occurred at Hankow. Rumors of overtures for concerted action with the United States in handling the situation were current, but no official step was announced. On the other hand, it was understood that Chargé O'Malley, the British envoy at Hankow, had presented the Chinese Foreign Minister, Eugene Chen, with a definite set of proposals on behalf of his Government. Negotiations, however, between Mr. O'Malley and Chen, even if successful, would not necessarily put an end to the anxiety felt by the Government over Shanghai, on which its attention centered.

Greece.—On the score that Gen. Pangalos, the ex-Dictator, awaiting trial on treasonable charges, was the center of a contemplated hostile movement against the Government, he was transported from Athens, where he had been, to the Idzeddin prison in Crete. The Government announced that a strong movement was centering around him, undermining its authority and causing public alarm. It declared itself acquainted with this plot for some time, but unwilling to make any move, in order to avoid new disturbances. The press interpreted Pangalos' transfer as the first of a new series of measures to enforce internal quiet.

Ireland.—Some little improvement in the industrial depression that has existed in Belfast during the past

Shipment of
Bullion

Chinese
Crisis

Cabinet
Difficulties

New Inter-
nal Disorder

three years is forecast for the current year. Shipbuilding during 1926 showed an increase over the preceding year of sixty per cent in the total of tonnage. New orders are being received at a moderate rate; these orders, however, are not sufficient to relieve the menace of unemployment, since improved methods of mass-production make it possible to dispense with a considerable portion of the manpower. In the linen industry, there is not so much optimism. Recently one of the largest firms went bankrupt. The exports during 1926 fell below those of 1925 by more than a million pounds. The American demand for Belfast linen is about fifty per cent less than it was two years ago.—Serious difficulty is being experienced by the authorities in administering the new Education Act. The estimates for the coming year are somewhat higher than in the past; in the midst of the general depressed condition of business and industry, these increased estimates become a real burden to the ratepayers. In the new system, the local authorities must contribute to the costs.

Prison Statistics

According to data issued on the authority of the Free State Ministry of Justice, there has been a steady decline in the numbers of the prison population. At the present time, the prisoners in Free State jails number 750, a decrease of about 100 since the corresponding time last year. In 1900, the prisoners held in the whole of Ireland amounted to 2,713; in 1913, through a steady decrease each succeeding year, they numbered 2,129; of these totals, the Free State proportion would be represented by about two-thirds. Since the Free State has been in existence, eliminating the years 1922 and 1923 as abnormal, the annual figures were: 1924, 980; 1925, 923; 1926, 853. The main reason for this decline, as stated in the Irish press, is the reduction in the consumption of alcohol. As a result of the decrease in the number of prisoners, several prisons throughout the country have been closed. Despite these optimistic statistics, the Republicans have been attacking the Free State Government because of the retention of political prisoners, though the Government has given assurance that such prisoners are detained because of crimes other than political. Portions of the Irish-American press have charged the police and military with "atrocities" committed on prisoners taken during the raids before Christmas. A headline in one paper stated: "Men beaten until unrecognizable and unconscious; forced to stand in icy water until almost frozen, and threatened with death if they did not give information regarding members of the Irish Republican Army." No reports on this matter have thus far appeared in the Irish press.

Election Results

Jugoslavia.—The Government Coalition, consisting of the Serbian Radical and the Croatian Peasants' parties, won a majority of the parliamentary seats in twenty-eight out of thirty-three departments into which the country is divided. In nineteen of these the Radicals obtained an absolute majority by themselves. The Government victory is,

however, due largely to gerrymandering. The fact is that the departments vary in population from 100,000 to 800,000, the large sections belonging to the Croats and Slovenians, where the Radicals are weak. The result of the elections means that efforts will now be made to carry out the centralization policy in place of the federalism which the Croats had persistently demanded. It may be found that the strength of the Uzunovitch Government is not as great as the elections make it appear.

Rebels and Oil

Mexico.—There were indications that the Calles Government had been greatly heartened by the display of power over Congress made by its friends in this country. The first sign of this was the suspension of drilling operations of twenty-five oil wells because of the failure of operating companies to comply with the new petroleum law. The total number of permit cancellations up to January 25 was 149, and at that time less than 100 wells were active. Large numbers of workmen were thrown out of work by these cancellations, and discontent was rife. At the same time, the severe censorship hindered news of the revolution under the "National Government of Freedom" from reaching this country. From other sources, however, word came of heavy fighting in Jalisco; of a desperate attack on San Miguel in Michoacan; of the capture of Empalme Gonzalez, an important railway center in Guanajuato; of an attack on Santa Maria in Guerrero; of a severe defeat inflicted on the Federals at Comonfort, the rout of three Federal columns in Durango, and the beginning of a new uprising in Zacatecas. Several new generals joined the uprising during the week, and a total of 26,000 men were in arms under the standard of the popular movement. The news spread in the United States that the Yaqui Indians had yielded was utterly false, the best proof of which was contained in the attack made by the Indians on a train carrying Gen. Fausto Topete. The railroad strike was spreading rapidly, violence occurred in many places, and railroad lines, bridges and wires were continually being cut in all parts of the country.—A telegram received by the N. C. W. C. News Service in Washington announced that Bishop Diaz had sailed from Costa Rica for Havana. The next day, however, brought word that Cuba had passed a law excluding from that island political exiles from other countries.

United States Treaty Killed

Panama.—The proposed new treaty with the United States was virtually rejected on January 26, when the National Assembly passed a resolution suspending further consideration of the document and requesting the President to open negotiations with the State Department of the United States looking to a solution that would satisfy the complete aspirations of the nation. Thirty-nine members of the Assembly signed the resolution, which was approved on the first ballot. They justified their action by the fact that the Assembly Committee had not reported the treaty favorably on account of grave and complex

questions, because the United States Senate had not yet considered it, and because of the popular unfavorable reaction to it.

Poland.—For the first time since the rule of the last Polish King, about 125 years ago, the head of the Polish nation, acting as representative of the Holy Father, bestowed the Cardinal's hat at Warsaw. The ceremony was performed by President Ignaz Mosicki, who took from a silver tray the Cardinal's biretta and placed it on the head of Mgr. Lauri, Papal Nuncio to Poland, whom the Holy See had raised to the Cardinalate. The ceremony was performed in the President's residence, the Zamek Palace, while vast crowds knelt in the streets outside the residence. The event was hailed as a renewal of Polish faith. The ceremony itself was carried out amid the utmost splendor. Marshal Pilsudski entered the palace in company with three Archbishops, and the highest military, political and ecclesiastical dignitaries did honor to the occasion. The greatest distinction in the power of the Government to bestow, the Order of the White Eagle, was further conferred on the new Cardinal.

Of considerable importance were the negotiations entered into between Poland and Lithuania for a rapprochement of some kind to terminate the enmity existing because of the claims of both nations to the rightful possession of Vilna. The plan suggested contemplates a joint Polish-Lithuanian Government for the entire Vilna region. —As regards internal politics a significant political move of the Government was the appointment of a member of the Left Peasants' party to the newly created Ministry of Posts and Telegraphs. It was an effort to win at least some slight support from the Left.

Rome.—A letter from the Holy Father to Cardinal Gasparri was published on January 24 in the *Osservatore Romano*. In this letter the Holy Father forestalled the application of Premier Mussolini's recent legislation by which the Catholic *Giovani Esploratori* (the Italian equivalent of Boy Scouts) should be suppressed in towns of less than 20,000 inhabitants, and incorporated with the national Balilla, the Fascist organization for youth. In his letter, the Holy Father ordered the dissolution of Catholic Scout organization in towns of less than the required number of inhabitants, and declared all others to be completely autonomous, leaving them free to choose for themselves whether they would remain as at present or join the national institution of Balilla's. The Holy Father admitted that the Fascist decree is not intended to attack the prerogative of the Church. He continued:

This We wish to state explicitly. But We must immediately add that this intention has not been realized and that the text of the decrees, as they have been published, justifies those apprehensions and fears We expressed in Our last consistorial allocution. . . . The decrees prescribe the teaching of a doctrine which We have reason to believe to be founded on or to culminate in a con-

ception of government which, in two allocutions, We have already defined as not conforming to the Catholic conception. . . . It would be unjust and unnecessary to attribute to the measure We have taken before God and man any intention of animosity or reprisal. We wish, on the contrary, to spare them (the Fascist Government) the ungrateful task of dissolving so many sections of good and peaceful Boy Scouts.

The Pope maintained in his letter that none of the "Catholic Action" organizations should be dissolved, since the decree explicitly stated that it exempts all organizations "with prevalently religious aims." But in the case of the "Catholic Action" organizations, the aims are not only prevalently, but essentially religious. In conclusion, the Holy Father suggested that the religious education of Boy Scouts who have passed into the Balilla should be cared for by priests appointed at the request of the leaders of the Balilla organizations, by the local Bishops. In contrast to the strictly non-political character of the "Catholic Action" organizations, the Holy Father pointed out the political nature of the national Balilla and its consequent perils.

Russia.—The Soviet Government informed the League of Nations on January 24 that it will not participate in the coming International Economic Conference to be held at Geneva. The reason was given that the League had refused to take sides in the diplomatic contest with Switzerland over the assassination of the Soviet envoy Vorovsky. This same difficulty with regard to the Swiss Government's refusal to condemn the assassination of Vorovsky had been urged repeatedly by the Soviet Government as a stock objection to various League of Nations' proposals.

The Soviet Minister of War, M. Voroshilov, in a speech delivered before the Provincial Communist Congress in Moscow, uttered warning of the grave danger that would be incurred by the Soviet Republics in the event of war with other nations. He assured his hearers that fifty to sixty per cent of them would be called to service in case of war. Such a conflict would mean an intolerable burden for Soviet Russia at the present time. Financial disaster would inevitably result, and the ensuing chaos would facilitate a change of régime. The Soviet anxiety about war was referred to a fear of aggressive measures on the part of England and Poland.

Some time ago, Edward F. Garesché addressed a questionnaire to 200 secretaries of the Y.W.C.A. Next week he will begin a series of three articles based on the answers he received. This series is of the utmost importance.

William C. Murphy, Jr., in "A New Departure in the Senate," will bring out in clear relief the constitutional importance of a recent vote by the United States Senate.

Ronald Knox will contribute an article entitled "These Statistics."

AMERICA

A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1927

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS

Editor-in-Chief

JOSEPH HUSSEIN PAUL L. BLAKELY FRANCIS X. TALBOT

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN JOHN LAFARGE

Associate Editors

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00

Canada, \$4.50 - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, Suite 4847, Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y.

U. S. A.

Telephone: Murray Hill 1635

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts

Pius XI, Mussolini, and the School

THE complete text of the Letter of His Holiness, Pius XI, to Cardinal Gasparri, published in the *Osservatore Romano* for January 24, has not been received in this country. Enough has been published, however, to throw into clear relief the reason which prompted the Holy Father to dissolve the Catholic *Giovani Esploratori* (Boy Scouts) in towns of fewer than 20,000 inhabitants.

In keeping with his policy of enlisting every factor which can contribute to the stability of the State, Mussolini has been actively promoting a Boy Scout movement, popularly known as the "Balilla." In this work he has displayed his usual vigor, with the result that friction has developed from time to time between the "Balillas" and the Catholic Scouts. At the beginning of the present year Mussolini planned to remove the friction by removing the Scouts—which he thereupon ordered to dissolve or be merged, in the smaller towns, with the "Balilla."

The Holy Father answers this decree in his Letter of January 24. He directs the disbanding of the Scouts in the smaller towns, and this in order "to relieve them [the Fascist Government] of the ungrateful task of dissolving so many sections of good and peaceful Boy Scouts, in which the populations of the small centers took so much pride." The Pontiff disavows any intent of embarrassing the Government. He freely concedes that the decree of Mussolini was not intended to infringe upon the rights of the Church or of Italian Catholics. "This We wish to state explicitly. But We must immediately add that this intention has not been realized, and that the text of the decree justifies the apprehensions and fears which We expressed in Our last consistorial allocution."

Pius XI here goes straight to the heart of the differences between the Holy See and the Italian Government. He recalls that the "Balilla" decree "prescribes the

teaching of a doctrine which We have reason to believe to be founded on, or to culminate in, a conception of government not conforming to the Catholic conception."

The reference is to the allocution of December 20, 1926. (Cf. AMERICA, January 1, 1927, p. 275.) It is plain that Mussolini desires the young men of Italy to be imbued with a certain philosophy of government. This philosophy is not confined to abstract political views or preferences; since it is a philosophy, it discusses human acts and human rights. According to Pius XI, it does not conform to "the Catholic conception."

But in what respect, chiefly, does it depart from that conception?

The Pontiff does not deal in generalities. The philosophy in question, he said, in his allocution of December 20, 1926, "makes the State an end in itself, and citizens mere means to that end, absorbing and monopolizing everything."

It is an alluring theory, not indeed when exposed in all its ultimate crudity, but when presented as an effective instrument to produce stability in the State. We have long suffered from it in this country. It has so firmly entrenched itself in the minds of many as to become a grave menace to constitutional government. The conception condemned by Pius XI as well as by American constitutional principles leads directly to an over-lord State, the source of all rights and the sanction of every duty, and culminates in the control of every human activity, especially in the school and in the church, by the civil authority. Indeed, the philosophy of the Communist State, as exemplified in Russia and Mexico, and of ultra-Fascism, is one and the same philosophy: the supremacy of the State over every aspect of human life. The Church is fighting it in Russia and Mexico, France and Italy, and it is mustering its forces in the United States against the Church.

Pius XI knows well that these groups of young Catholic Italians have not been banded together merely to wear a uniform, to march, or to engage in athletic contests. They have been set apart to be taught, and, in particular, to be indoctrinated with a definite philosophy of life and action. But it is the right, as it is the duty, of the Catholic Church to say in what philosophy her children shall be trained. She recently exercised this right in condemning the *Action Française*. She exercises it again in declining to permit Mussolini to imbue the young men of Italy with a conception of government which is at variance with the Catholic conception.

The real point of the Pontiff's Letter is to be found, then, in his repudiation of the principle that education is the monopoly of the State. In order to minimize the evils which he apprehends from the suppression of the Catholic Union, he directs the Bishops and priests to make plans for "the religious education" of the members of the "Balilla." With this arrangement the Pontiff is not wholly content, but he will tolerate it in the hope that through mutual good will a better programme can be secured.

In concluding his Letter, the Holy Father observes with pain and anxiety that similar movements are taking place "in other countries, far and near." Possibly no reference to the United States was implied, but an application can be deduced. If the conflict in this country is not as yet sharp, the reason is to be found in our State and Federal constitutional guarantees. But how long can these be maintained in face of the ceaseless attack to which they are subjected by powerful lobbies, and by propagandist societies which not infrequently win the allegiance of unwary Catholics?

We won our fight against the principle of State monopoly in education, when the Supreme Court affirmed the natural right of the parent to control the education of his child. For Catholics now to give any countenance to educational schemes for Catholic youth which do not square with the Catholic conception, would be to throw away the fruits of that great victory. In his condemnation of the *Action Française* and in his Letter to Cardinal Gasparri, the Holy Father has issued the word of command. The training of Catholic youth must be based *exclusively* on Catholic principles of education.

Your Grandmother and Senator Borah

YOU probably never saw your venerable grandmother (bless the dear old lady!) bite off a large black chunk of navy plug, and thereafter peer about the room in search of a cuspidor. But you have been preserved to witness a far more marvelous spectacle: that of the unterrified Senator from Idaho deploring with grief and viewing with alarm the encroachment by the Federal Government on the rights of the sovereign States! After this, not a flicker of interest would be aroused were Henry Ford to apply for membership in a Jewish synagogue, or Senator Moses to vote for a Democrat.

What Senator Borah says on this subject is quite true. But evidence that Senator Borah himself attaches any importance to his own words is wholly lacking. If in the course of the debate a few weeks ago on that paragon of Federal encroachment, the maternity bill, the Senator from Idaho spoke one word in condemnation, his tones were so low and frightened that the reporter for the *Congressional Record* failed to hear him. Nor do we forget how when the voters in the sovereign State of New York registered their conviction that the control of the liquor traffic should be taken from the Federal Government and vested in the several States, the Senator from Idaho arose in fury and portentous wrath to denounce them as nullifiers of the Constitution.

Senator Borah is probably an admirer of the works of Mark Twain. In that case we commend him to Huck Finn's father, who reserved his denunciations of the Federal Government to certain interesting periods. The Senator's life is as "dry" as his votes for Prohibition, but alcohol is not the only intoxicant.

It is our weakness to love any public man who defends the Constitution. But when his oratory runs one way and his acts another, our affection falls to zero.

The Government Takes Over "The World"

THE recent action of the Federal Government in taking over the real-estate holdings of certain newspapers has naturally given rise to some comment. Foremost among the protesters is the New York *World*. The decree will not be effective until six months hence, but "confiscation," "theft," "oppression," are phrases not allowed to rest idle in the office of the *World*.

It is difficult to see what legal grounds the *World* can possibly allege. The Amendment entitling the Federal Government to acquire these properties without compensation cannot be questioned. In enforcing the Amendment, Congress has kept well within the limits of its authority. Of course, it can be argued that the Federal Government has deprived the *World* of the immensely valuable tract of land on which its plant is located, but the very statute under which the Government has acted affords the *World* a ready means of redress. On proper application, the Government will grant a lease on the property which will run from five to twenty years, and may even be extended to sixty.

The protests of the *World*, particularly its cries of "confiscation," are simply sound and fury. But it is well to remember that a continuance will justify the Government in adopting a certain line of repression which under other circumstances might smack of severity. The Constitution can and must be upheld.

It is amusing to note that in this very connection the *World* has already given its case away. Some fifty years ago—in 1926, to be accurate—the Government of Mexico by constitutional enactment took over certain tracts of land belonging to a group of American citizens. Very properly, the *World* at that time turned against the Americans and upheld the Mexican Government. A search of the files shows that under date of January 22, 1927, it condemned the proposition that the Mexican Government be asked to submit its acts to "arbitration." "The Mexicans naturally hesitate," it wrote, "before the idea that they shall submit their own Constitution and their own laws to international arbitration."

The *World* knows now, if it did not then, that the Mexican Constitution of 1917 was not the work of the Mexican people, and did not express their wishes. It had never been ratified by them, for the simple fact is that it had never been submitted to them. The alleged "laws" which followed were simply the work of a Congress absolutely subservient to the Administration of the time. But the Amendment of 1970 under which the American Government takes over the holdings of the *World* stands on an entirely different footing. It was duly passed by Congress, submitted to the States, and ratified.

As the *World* remarked fifty years ago, when the Americans protested against "confiscation" of their property by the Mexican Government, "It may transpire that after all in the actual administration of the laws no damage is intended and none is done." (January 22, 1927.) The *World* can now take refuge in that same conclusion. Let it apply to the Government for a lease on its former

property, and it will discover that "no damage is intended and none is done."

Our Federal Bootlegger

THE Treasury Department has admitted that agents of the Federal Government have conducted a whiskey-still in North Carolina, operated a speak-easy in the slums of Norfolk, Virginia, and a night-club in New York. Every one of these acts is a violation of the Volstead act, punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both.

The Government's plea in justification is that these acts were necessary for the detection of law-violators. General Andrews and Commissioner Blair admit that they are "improper" except when used to entrap "the higher-ups" in organized liquor rings."

This plea leaves us gasping. It is something entirely unheard of that any official of the United States has power to authorize the commission of crime. Technically, at least, the Volstead act is a law. It comes with poor grace for a Prohibition Administrator to beg respectable citizens to obey the Volstead act at the very time that the Government is employing ex-convicts and thugs, and directing them to disobey it.

It is not of record that any Federal official has been subjected to the legal penalties attached to violation of the Volstead act. Nor does the Government seem disposed to move against them. The theory seems to be that "anything goes" in the attempt to force the American people to obey an enactment for which millions of them have no respect whatever.

That theory squares with the Government's acts. At Washington it employs the services of an expert poisoner. In Norfolk it goes down into the slums to enlist ex-convicts and dive-keepers. In New York it opens a night-club where it openly buys and sells intoxicating beverages. Throughout the country it maintains, according to Secretary Mellon's report, an unknown number of spies and *agents provocateurs*. Thus does the Government itself desecrate the high and holy name of law!

The Next Coal Strike

WE are not troubling our placid soul over the woes of the public. In fact, we are becoming hardened to the sufferings of a public which, apparently, is content with a war in the mines every few years. Our chief concern is for the interests of law and order. It may not be true that you cannot conduct a strike on the principles of the Golden Rule. Possibly an exception can be noted here and there, by the trained investigator. But during the course of the average strike, excesses which grieve the cooler moments of the more judicious are the order of the day. Hence, whether the strike is lost or won, the result in destroying the public's reverence for authority in the State and Federal Government is often deplorable.

The contract under which the bituminous-coal miners are working expires about seven weeks hence. Unless the committees from the fields in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio

and Western Pennsylvania reach an agreement by March 31, about 350,000 miners will be thrown out of work and into another disastrous strike.

It must be confessed that the problem of reorganization of the mines is not easy. President Lewis, of the United Mine Workers of America, said at the recent biennial convention a few days ago that the industry is suffering from "too many incompetent and irresponsible operators." This leads to ruthless competition among all the operators, good and bad. Wages go down, the number of working-days decreases, and the miner soon faces starvation. The public is interested solely in beating down the price of coal. The operators are solely interested in keeping it up. The miner is crushed between the two. He protests, and rightly, that he cannot live on a starvation-wage. The operators reply with equal justice that because of cut-throat competition they cannot pay a living wage.

Congress has not acted, probably because it realizes its lack of authority. Federal control based on the interstate commerce clause is too remote, and may become too political, to be effective. Action taken by one State can, and probably would, be nullified by the failure of another State to act. But, if sanctioned by Congress, the coal-States could enter into a treaty to take over the mines, or, at least, to regulate production, prices and wages. We are not aware that this remedy has been suggested, but with all deference we submit it to those whom it may concern.

What Can We Arbitrate?

AS an affirmation of the principle that the United States prefers arbitration to other means of settling international disputes, Senator Robinson's resolution is admirable. In all other respects, it is like a skyrocket—very pretty while it flares, but of no value after the powder has been burned.

For the question presents itself at once, "What can we arbitrate?" If Senator Robinson believes that Calles is ready to arbitrate the issues between Mexico and the United States, he is doomed to grievous disappointment. Calles will simply affirm that since the act under which American properties were taken by the Government was passed by the Mexican Congress to give effect to the Constitution, it is not subject to arbitration.

That closes one door. On our side, what have we to arbitrate?

To protect its citizens and their property is among the first duties of the Government. Under the forms of law, the Mexican Government has broken contracts with American citizens and has deprived them of their property. Surely Senator Robinson cannot suppose that the United States is ready to debate its duty, when its plain duty is clearly established.

It is bad enough when one party to a debate refuses to debate. When both refuse, all we can do is to turn out the lights, and go home.

Their Idea of God

HILAIRE BELLOC

Copyright, 1927

I HESITATE somewhat at touching a subject so awful and one requiring so much detachment and knowledge as is the subject which the reader has seen in my title. But, after all, I am not dealing with that most profound affair in itself, but only with the almost incredible ignorance of our opponents on the doctrine which is the very foundation of all doctrine and of all rational thought.

For I have come across lately two sentences, each proceeding from the pen of important, solidly established men, of high university position in England, each deeply read in biological science, and each, I think, fairly representative of a myriad others less learned than himself, and of many who are his equals in the academic world of our time.

I do honestly think it a portent that stuff of such a sort should appear almost without comment, and as a matter of course in a society still possessed of the externals of civilization and professing, I suppose, to some knowledge, if not of true philosophy at least of history and the authorities of the past.

The two sentences were to this effect:

The first said that with the advance of our knowledge of cause and effect in physical affairs "there was not much room left for the idea of God."

The second said (it was written in connection with the controversy on Natural Selection—a controversy which, oddly enough, still has some vitality) that the theory of Mutations (i.e., the idea that Evolution has proceeded not slowly, but by jumps) "left an opening for God to design these sudden changes, and so might satisfy those who wanted to bring God into the discussion."

Now note the idea which was obviously taken for granted in both these people's minds. It has been taken for granted, I suppose, in the minds of countless numbers around us, and it is a very singular and emphatic test of the decline both of instruction and of intelligence in our day. The idea thus taken for granted is that the God of Catholic theology is a Being who acts only when direct physical cause and effect are not at work. Further, both these writers take for granted—in common with I know not how many hundreds of others—that people have imagined God only as a convenient way of explaining a number of hitherto unexplained phenomena.

For instance, they take it for granted that a man seeing the tides rise and fall, and not knowing anything of their immediate cause in the attraction of the sun and moon upon the waters, would ascribe the tides to the power of God; but the same man, having become acquainted with the immediate cause of the phenomenon, would no longer ascribe it to the power of God.

We must make every allowance for the fact that these people have been brought up without a philosophy of any kind. Most of them have been brought up simply to believe in the printed word of the Jacobean translation of Holy Writ, and in the literal exactitude of every phrase—every *English* phrase—in the family Bible; as, for instance, that the Hebrew word "*yom*," being translated "day," means a day of 24 hours: which it does not necessarily mean. We must also make every allowance for the fact that there is no place in the mass of modern education for the merest elements of theology.

Every Catholic who has learned the Penny Catechism by heart has acquired more of the elements of philosophy than the whole of that world outside. Whether he knows it or not, he has been taught to think. These people have not been taught to think. Yet I should have imagined—left to myself and lacking the strange experience provided by reading their works—that the human intellect had enough strength in itself without any training to think at least to that extent. But apparently it is not so; apparently men can go about their business, write books on scientific subjects, show a reasonable measure of intellectual activity, and yet remain quite incapable of appreciating the simplest elements of thought.

A man discovers the interesting fact, hitherto unknown, that two substances, for instance, oxygen and hydrogen, will under certain circumstances unite to make a third—to wit, water; or, conversely, he discovers that water, a simple thing, can be split up under certain circumstances into two other things, oxygen and hydrogen. In this discovery he has increased our examples of cause and effect, but he has not added one iota to the ultimate conception of cause and effect. He has added one more item to a list which already consisted, even in the case of the savage or the child, of thousands of items: the immense list of physical causes regularly producing physical effects; but he has not added anything whatsoever to our knowledge of the *nature* of cause and effect.

From the beginning men have known that salt dissolved in water, and that if you mixed salt and water under certain conditions you produced something different from the original water and different from the original salt; conversely they have known that under certain conditions you could separate them again. For instance, you could boil off the water and condense it again into fresh water and leave the salt sediment separated. Between this and a chemical combination there is no difference in discovery whatsoever save one of addition.

When men said (and we Catholics are old-fashioned enough to say it still) that God had endowed matter with certain qualities and, what is more, that He maintained

the whole of the material universe, which without Him would cease to be; when they also affirmed that the whole business in its millions of actions and reactions was created, they did so with just as much knowledge of the ultimate end of things as a man possessed of all modern science (if there be such a man), or as the latest discoverer of the latest discovery in physical things.

They did not say, "Behold, the salt has disappeared and mixed somehow mysteriously with the water, and then again mysteriously reappears when we boil the water off; this is unaccountable. We must regard it as a sort of conjuring trick, and imagine an unseen powerful Being to have worked the trick." What they said was: "All these affairs, from the simplest to the most complex, are part of the Creation; the Creation, the universe, presupposes a designing Mind." It was left to our own day to reach that level, that depth of intellectual ineptitude, in which the conception of God should fall to a conception of nothing but occasional interference.

This piece of stupidity also works the other way round. It is just this same type of mind as denies the possibility of occasional interference, which also denies the possibility of miracle. The same man who has never heard of the theological definition of God as immanent and transcendent, and thinks of Him as no more than an imaginary occasional worker of miracles, naturally comes to think miracles themselves impossible, because he believes an event which we call a miracle can only be due to inevitable physical cause and effect.

At the end of these random thoughts I come back, as I always do in such musings, to the practical question: What is to be done about it? How are we to teach these apparently unteachable people?

I think, to begin with, by protest: perpetual, insistent, and aggressive. That does not go very far, but it is a beginning. We might, perhaps, in time, if enough of us talk and write strongly enough, create an atmosphere in which the modern non-Catholic will get a little nervous about his own postulates: an intellectual atmosphere in which he will be afraid that he may after all be making a fool of himself. To create such an atmosphere is only going a very little way on the road to saving civilization from breakdown. But it is a beginning, at any rate.

LOVE'S YOUNG DREAM

Did you recall, Methusalah,
When you were white and old,
A maid, a moonlit night and a
Sweet vow you told?

Methusalah, did you recall
The song your heart had sung,
When she was fair, and love was all
And you were young?

And count each lonely century
And live the days again
When you were a hundred and twenty and she
A hundred and ten?

LEONARD FEENEY, S.J.

The Gentle Art of Insult

LOUIS F. DOYLE, S.J.

I HAVE had recently a psychological experience so replete with novel thrill, so epoch-making in my grey life, so exalting, that I would feel guilty of robbing the psychological world of precious data should I permit myself to be daunted by typophobia, if that be good Freudian for "fear of cold print." I have felt the nectarine flame of noble indignation spread its slow warmth through the farthest provinces of my being and tingle like very god-head in my plebeian veins.

Thirty-five years a Catholic and thirteen a Jesuit, I have at last risen to righteous anger at insult to my Faith. So often had I failed in the Divine emotion that I had decided the stars were not for me, when lo! Simeon-like, I am late rewarded. *Nunc dimittis!* Insulted, I have flamed. It is the autumn breakup of an inferiority complex, perhaps.

Insult open and veiled, elaborate and casual—golden opportunities, have courted me for years. Time and again I have invoked the proper powers that I might rise to the histrionic grandeur of the fleeting moment, but alas! Melpomene invoked, Thalia responded. In the crisis, the afflatus always failed. Never could I shake off the feeling of detachment, of having received a message not intended for me. I was drowsy with the thought that nothing would make any difference in the final outcome somehow, that the Scripture was being fulfilled, that the Rock of Peter required no bolstering from me.

When manifestly my proper line were, "False knave; falser than falsehood, I brand you false!" my response, flatter than any setpiece of the scene, was "But you've misunderstood the Church. She doesn't teach anything like that. That's bad history." Picture the accompanying gesture, a hand poised fishlike in midair until, suddenly realizing ownership, I recall it peremptorily and the curtain falls.

The spirit of wrath simply would not inhabit me and the golden moment passed me by contemptuously. I do not wish to be misunderstood: I do not mean an opportunity for inserting the cold chisel of truth in the solid masonry of a mind triple-walled with ignorance, bigotry and arrogance, but an opportunity of breaking a lance Quixote-like against that heedless wall. So I shrugged, said, "Peter is the Rock," and went away to a cup of tea as being more profitable and less tiring. Do you wonder, then, that having been visited by, not a devastating hurricane of rage, but a fairly respectable little gust of indignation, I give it to the world? I only trust that such sudden dramatic and emotional affluence may not bear the common fruit of great and belated prosperity and melt away in maudlin complacency.

Beside the tremendous fact of my emotional renaissance, the occasion appears distinctly minor. In itself it is so small and so perpetually present that I can only marvel at the mysterious ways of the tragic muse who denies the divine rush of blood to the head when great

moments invite to the combat, and grants the epic brain-storm at such a trifle. However, small events take on the color of grand consequence, as witness Mrs. O'Leary's cow and the lantern.

There has been appearing lately in one of New York's most authoritative literary sheets the advertisement of a new and startling offering—the "Lost Books of the Bible." It is ushered in by the carefully worded recommendations of a Provost of Eton, a great Anglican Archbishop, and a foremost American journalist. "I, SIMON PETER!" is the shrieking caption. We are being treated to the lost Gospel of St. Peter discovered after twenty centuries in an Egyptian tomb. (Egyptian tombs bid fair to become a world's greatest industry). The countenance of Peter in the gigantic illustration that ekes out the double page of space wears a befuddled, post-convivial expression as of one who strives to recall when and how he produced the manuscript in question. A score or so of other apocryphal works are also included.

As I have said, the occasion is minor, as minor as the spark that starts a forest fire. We have done with it already.

One bright particular fine art has never fallen into decay, the exquisite art of belittlement by insult, better known as "high hatting." When one traces its nameless progress and steady growth from very humble beginnings to its present place paramount in a well night perfect civilization, he finds matter for amazement. How the power of the lightly spoken and oft reiterated word has made itself felt in the evolution of things!

Sticks and stones may batter my bones
But words can never harm me.

I trust I quote correctly that tuneful fallacy of an age when the gentle art was very, very young. It marks a very early and humble stage in the technique of the art, which was being suckled by a wolf when clubs were prime persuaders, was still a toddling child when the sword carved Q. E. D. at the end of every argument between gentlemen, and was but a star-eyed gangling youth when cannon began to shed light on vexed questions. Who then foresaw that these grim dispensers of death would be supplanted in a few centuries by such weapons as tall hats, lorgnettes, monocles, a glassy stare, and a languid, "Really; never heard of him!"

The first appearance of the high hat in history is disputable no doubt. Personally, I seem to discern it on the godlike head of the son of Philip of Macedon. When his father's glorious work was at last complete, his youthful son's only comment was a yawn, "Heighho! No more worlds to conquer!" I surmise that the paternal jaw dropped a trifle at that. It was the sparrow leaping lightly on the head of the eagle at the home stretch, to say the least. Alexander, I suspect, has been robbed of his greater fame by an undiscerning posterity; he was a pioneer high-hatter.

What the art can affect when applied by a master is to be seen in the brilliant career of that crown jewel of London society two centuries ago, the fragrant dandy whom

a court courted until his overtopping insolence brought the pillars of destruction about his ears by bidding a crown prince, "Ring the bell, George, I'll have my carriage." Beau Brummell did much to form the puissant art, the sublimite into which club and cannon and sword and law and propaganda have at last melted in this ultimate culture that is ours. All the iron ages have yielded up the Age of Irony and the High Hat.

Dipping into the future, I foresee the day when the dreamed-of universal peace shall be maintained with effortless ease by a central committee of accomplished high-hatters. "At every word a reputation falls," wrote the eighteenth century. What small game! Whole institutions shall then come tumbling down. Empire shall be impossible when the destructive art shall have been perfected. Truth and honor shall be equally impossible. Then shall we have peace, for nothing will remain worth fighting for.

Consequently, when great names assure me that the Lost Books of the Bible are now easily within the reach of hot desire and cold cash, those books which, as they are, the grave Fathers of the Tridentine Council rejected as apocryphal because they failed to stand a test that anticipated the spiritualistic seance by centuries, I cannot but feel that the gentle art has neared its full flower. When assured by an advertisement in the *New York Times* Literary Review, endorsed by outstanding names in the realm of "thought," that when the Holy Spirit was invoked in a darkened room wherein was a table and on it all books that were candidates for the Sacred Canon, the restored light revealed the books of the present Tridentine Canon *on* the table and these Lost Books *under* the table, my prophetic soul is rapt in amaze at the tallest hat I have yet seen on anti-Catholic propaganda—a large and generous statement! The sword is medieval; logic is passé; history is obsolescent; and the high hat has emerged to empery in the realm of truth.

Nunc dimittis! I have lived to see more than the millennium. And as I go I seem to hear a voice, "Suavely, gentlemen! Suavely does it! We expect every hat to do its duty. Up with the monocles and we'll give 'em a broadside! Don't lose your hats and the day is ours. Boldly! But suavely!"

COLORS OF LIFE

Never have a dark thought,
Always have a bright,
Sweep it into color
Of the dawn-light.
Squeeze your tubes of ochre,
Wet your squares of red,
Let the brilliant morning
Stream overhead.
See that not dark thoughts
Your heart from beauty locks,
Wash life to colors
Of your paint-box.

ISABEL FISKE CONANT.

Bolshevism in Mexico a Proven Fact

CHARLES J. SEITZ

WHATEVER may be the relationship between Mexico and Russia as regards the direct influence of the Russian Bolsheviks in Mexico, there can be no possible doubt that Mexico is governed under a thoroughly communistic theory, executed by men in the fullest sympathy with the principles of the revolution that disintegrated Russia.

Secretary of State Kellogg, in his presentation of the situation to the Senate early this year, confined himself to the submission of facts that have long been a matter of common knowledge to every student of Mexican conditions. He did not seek to bolster his argument with specific instances of syndicalist interference in business and of consequent outrages against the property and lives of Americans and other nationals under the Calles régime in Mexico, though a tremendous fund of this data is doubtless in the possession of the State Department.

Considered purely as a philosophy of life, which aims, among other things, at the destruction of property rights as they have existed in more enlightened countries for centuries, there can be no question that Bolshevism is the ruling principle of the present Mexican Government. With this proved, as I shall prove it, it leaves the United States confronted with the question as to whether or not it can permit this destructive practice to operate on the American continent against the rights of its own citizens, and, under every sound interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, against those of European countries. The Monroe thesis, as now evolved, denies European countries the right to intervene on this continent in behalf of their nationals and in return guarantees protection for all their fundamental rights by the United States.

The true condition of affairs in Mexico is not revealed in the press reports reaching this country, which, so far, have concerned themselves almost solely with the confiscation of American-owned oil properties, which comprise less than one-fourth of the American investment there: \$318,638,000 out of \$1,389,061,000 (U. S. Consular Reports, Dec., 1926). There are various reasons for this, but the chief of them is that the Mexican Government is so completely dominated by the *Confederacion Regional Obrera Mexicana*, the labor organization popularly known as the CROM, that only such news items as it approves are permitted to be published in the Mexican papers, to say nothing of sending them out of the country.

To appreciate fully the operation of this vicious proletarian combine, it must be understood that Calles, at the outset of his administration, made a contract with the CROM leaders under which he agreed to delegate to them virtually all the executive prerogatives of government, including the military forces, in return for the support of the workers' syndicates. The startling document under which this was done was printed in *Columbia*

for January, page 28. It provides for governmental support of the fundamental principle of Bolshevism as clearly as any contract possibly could.

Private advices, carefully authenticated and smuggled out of Mexico, are vastly more revealing than have been any of the stories sent out through the established channels of the press, heavily handicapped by the censorship. They enumerate hundreds of outrages against property and life under the direction of the CROM with the fullest support of the Government, as per the Calles contract. The following are a few recent examples:

Early in January, 1927, Carlos Young, a leading manufacturer of soaps, discharged an employe. The CROM at once demanded that the man be reinstated, but Mr. Young refused. That same day a committee from the CROM, accompanied by Government troops, visited Mr. Young's place and demanded entrance. Mr. Young barricaded his property, whereupon these representatives of the Government stole his automobile, standing in front of his office, and drove away in it.

A report on January 10 says:

The CROM continues its labor reign of terror and dictates to business and industry how they shall conduct their affairs. It is asserted on the highest authority that the recent editorials published by the newspaper *Excelsior*, containing a severe arraignment of the United States and which were offensive both in language and intent, were dictated by the CROM, and that the paper was compelled to publish them.

These editorials were cabled to the United States as indicative of Mexican public opinion. The report continues:

CROM spies are among the labor employed by both *Excelsior* and the *Universal*. These spies instantly notify the CROM leaders of any articles under preparation that are considered inimical to the interests of the organization. Recently the *Universal* had prepared to print an article and was about to go to press when the CROM intervened, notifying the paper that the article in question could not be published. As a protest the editors ordered the paper to press with the space left blank. The CROM again refused to permit the issue to run, compelling the editors to fill the space with "objectionable" material before the paper was allowed to go to press.

How business is interfered with by Labor is thus illustrated:

The Board of Arbitration and Conciliation is CROM-controlled and its decisions are invariably against the interests of business and industry. E. B. Welch, an American manufacturer, suffered months of work-suspension and near ruin because of CROM tactics in a strike declared against him. Now the courts have refused him the amparo [right of appeal] against the decision of the Board in the case of an employe he was compelled to discharge.

This throws some light on what Americans have to expect in similar appeals to Mexican courts, which are political in character, not judicial.

Certainly these things spell nothing but Bolshevism,

from whatever source the doctrine may have been derived. There is ample evidence, however, that Mexico is not unappreciative of the lesson it may learn from Russia, and that it has looked to the Soviet for guidance in the past. The reception accorded by Calles to Alexandra Kollontay, the newly accredited Ambassador to his country from Russia and one of the most ardent enemies of accepted ideals and philosophies of life, is not without significance. Calles' words "dear Russia" are remembered.

Then there is this report from Mexico City on January 10:

Pablo Mendez, the industrial attache of the Mexican Government at Moscow, is making a special study of Soviet systems, and Eduardo Cortina and Alvarado Mora, members of the House of Deputies from the State of Vera Cruz, have recently returned from Russia, where they also made a study of the "systems." They form part of the present Federal Congress which is passing the radical laws at the instigation of President Calles, all of which are communistic and anti-foreign in character.

A report sent out on January 12 says:

Notwithstanding that the spirit of revolution is growing with immense strides daily, and the extreme seriousness of the international situation, Calles persists in his policy regarding the confiscation of oil lands and other properties. He has also intensified the persecution of the Church and clergy. The infamous CROM continues its reign of terror, running the business and industry of the country with unstinted arrogance. The owners of the textile factories, comprising the largest industry of the country except mining and oil, state that the control and management of their mills are completely in the hands of the labor syndicates. The managers and superintendents are scarcely permitted to enter the plants.

If this is not Communism, then I do not know the meaning of that word. The report continues:

The American Smelting and Refining Company of New York (the Guggenheim interests) was sued for three months' salary by some employees it had let out. The Board of Arbitration and Conciliation, as is customary, sentenced the company to pay the salaries, which it refused to do. After attempting to reach the office-safe and funds of the firm in Mexico City, its account in the bank was attached and the bank was compelled to pay over the amount of the salaries. President Calles ordered an investigation and General Serrano personally proffered his apologies to the company, which, however, did not recover the funds diverted from its bank account by this high-handed procedure.

A similar incident is recorded at about the same time:

Some days ago Byrne Brothers, road builders for the Mexican Government, had their funds in the bank attached in the same manner by the Board of Arbitration and Conciliation, whose members presented themselves at the bank together with leaders of the CROM. The bank was compelled to pay over from the Byrne Brothers' account a sum similarly involved through a labor dispute.

This company recently decided to suspend operations, and discharged several thousand employees.

Possibly it is because the United States represents the greatest obstacle to the absolute abrogation of property rights in Mexico that most of the CROM outrages are directed against American interests as is also most of the anti-foreign propaganda inspired by the administration. Another report says:

The Government has obtained, for purposes of propaganda, the services of Bertha Singerman, a famous Argentine recitation artist, very popular throughout Mexico. On January 3, at Cor-

dova, State of Vera Cruz, her program included a number called "The Beast of Gold," which is a violent attack on American financial methods. Her tirade was well calculated to arouse hatred against the United States and incline her hearers to sympathy with the Calles Government in the present crisis.

The existence of these facts, and many others like them, is indisputable. The close relationship between Russia and Mexico has been amply proved. But even if it were not, these facts, and a dozen others like them, fully illustrate a situation which has long been known to all acquainted with Mexico. In the face of these facts, what becomes of the sneers of papers like the *New York World*, friendly to Calles, and of some Catholic papers which have been duped by them? Bolshevism in Mexico is not an illusion or a specter, but the one proved, outstanding fact in the industrial and business situation today.

The Woman's Side of It, Continued

MARGARET HUGHES

[AMERICA, while not agreeing unreservedly with all the implications in this article, presents it to the serious consideration of its readers. Its author lives in New Zealand.—Ed. AMERICA.]

I WONDER how many women read Mary Gordon's article in the *AMERICA* of September 18 with almost incredulous delight and appreciation. I know I devoured every word of it, and then laid it down with a very fervent "Thank God!" It was almost unbelievably good to find a Catholic woman of brains, education, character, and living faith, venturing to lift up her voice in a Catholic paper, on the vexed question of birth control. She has certainly given us fresh air and fresh vision, on a subject which badly needed both.

For too long, the question of birth control has been treated by writers as one upon which the Church has only one attitude, that of unconditional, stern and unrelenting disapproval. One longs to ask them to define their terms. How, otherwise, are we ever to struggle out of the fog of mystery and uncertainty which has clouded the whole issue? The Church is as a rule so lucid in her logic, so willing to demonstrate to all comers the grounds of her belief, that it is extraordinarily upsetting to find that on this one point, Catholic writers and speakers are apt to be vague, indefinite, emotional, almost hysterical. Surely the fact that they are dealing with a delicate subject need not necessitate this. Divorce is a delicate subject, but every well-instructed Catholic is very definite on the Church's teaching in that matter.

But when birth control is mentioned, the overwhelming majority of our Catholic authorities take the attitude of one who defends the last ramparts against a deadly enemy. We Catholic women are rallied to the banner of the Church by vague generalities, and by platitudes about duty and self-sacrifice, and the joys of motherhood. But never once, in our whole lifetime, from girlhood to old age, do writers appeal to us in this matter as rational human beings; and define her position thoroughly, definitely, and authoritatively. It isn't like the Church: it is absolutely unlike her ordinary sweet reasonableness: and

we Catholic women are puzzled, and inclined to be resentful.

We get an excellent grounding in Catholic doctrine in our schooldays. We have it instilled into us from babyhood; until now, in mature years, we could describe in our sleep how to baptize a baby, or enumerate the points at issue between the Holy See and the schismatic churches of the East. Yet when it comes to the Sacrament of Matrimony: its duties, its privileges, its responsibilities, its peculiar temptations, and its laws, we get the scantiest information, the most rudimentary instruction. And yet that same married state is going to be the most vital thing in the lives of most of us.

In that married state we must save or lose our souls: if we fail in its duties, we fail altogether. Many Catholic girls approach it blindfolded, with no faintest glimmering of what it implies. Those of us whose mothers were more conscientious and more compassionate, had more chance of married happiness. Too often, however, we have been led to the subject from the wrong angle, and our views are distorted, and do not touch the fringe of such vital subjects as birth control. This is principally, of course, because our elders have no logical ideas on the subject; nothing beyond a vague impression that the whole subject is beyond the pale, as far as Catholics are concerned.

So there we are: "trapped," as some people are so fond of saying of nuns. In reality, of course, there is no comparison between the finality of the cloister gates, and the finality with which marriage closes its gates on the young girl neophyte. In marriage there is no novitiate, no instruction in the duties of her state in life, no period of probation, no opportunity of reconsidering a hasty decision, and no mistress of novices to run to in every scruple and difficulty. She is hedged in by reticence from her dearest friends, even from her mother. The modesty which is her heritage, ordains that she shall do battle alone with her new problems.

There is no doubt that to a motlest woman, the stating of her own particular case to another is a difficult lifting of the veil of married life. How much better to have the whole thing thrashed out beforehand, in the harmless generalities of broad principles. Afterwards we should walk among the problems of the married state with the same sureness and confidence wherewith we walk in other matters pertaining to the Faith.

How can this best be done? Here there is room for much discussion and suggestion. Perhaps something might be done by means of classes for girls in their last year at school. Perhaps special classes of instruction for the engaged girls of every parish would meet the case better. And who would be the instructor? Perhaps a kind and fatherly priest, perhaps a wise nun, or a well-instructed matron who was willing to mother other daughters than her own. What noble work it would be for any woman! What a privilege it would be to build up, strong and sure, the foundations of Catholic marriages, to avert disaster in the future, to preserve the happiness of these blossoms of maidenhood!

For wedded happiness is a fragile flower, and easily withered by the winds of adverse circumstance. Mary Gordon rejoices in her four children, and has many things to make her happy. Yet she is not happy, because she lives in a rented home, and is getting no further forward, and is making no provision for the future. She has no place that she can think of in terms of affection as "the family homestead."

I too have four children, healthy, handsome, bright youngsters of whom any mother might be proud. I have the kindest, most chivalrous, most self-denying and hard-working husband in the world. And I have a family homestead, in the most picturesque country surroundings. And yet:—happiness? No, dear reader, not even with ingredients like these. For the family homestead is a very long way from any Catholic school; and it is mortgaged to its last hoof and its last blade of grass. My husband works early and late, and gets, from year to year, not one penny piece clear, for all his labor and economy. And out of the small independent income Providence has bestowed on me, and the little I earn by my pen in the intervals of housework, I send my children to Catholic schools many hundreds of miles away, and keep up insurances against the college days that are coming closer. By straining every nerve and muscle, and denying myself and my household every luxury of food and clothing, I can just make ends meet. But by the end of every quarter, if my dearest friend were dying. I couldn't put my hand on a pound note to carry me to her bedside.

The pressure of circumstance upon us has grown heavier with each passing year. Ten months after our wedding, the first baby found us in a cosy, pretty home near town; and the maternity nurse's expenses for six weeks were a matter of course.

The second baby came to us in a backblocks home, five miles from the nearest neighbor, and cut off from civilization by an unbridged river liable to flood. Needless to say, it was in flood the night the boy arrived. He was a strong, healthy child, and everything was normal. But his coming cost us £50 out of our annual income of £150.

By the time the third baby was due, there wasn't another £50 to spend on the event, because there wasn't an annual income of any kind. So I decided to economize by not having the nurse until the exact date. But in the meantime I overworked myself cooking for musterers, etc., and Baby arrived some weeks too soon—with complications. We only just saved his life; and for three days, he and I and the elder children were cared for by the neighbors, before any nurse was obtainable in our remote country district.

My fourth baby was born at a maternity home in town. I felt I couldn't face the risks of the backblocks again; but it meant a fortnight's waiting in town lodgings, to make things safe. Having had this extra expense I couldn't manage more than a fortnight in town afterwards, so I went home, and endeavored to start work again, with the result that I was a semi-invalid for some time. But this wasn't all. By the time the baby arrived, there wasn't any money at all, with which to pay medical

and nursing expenses; so my own people paid them, at the same time conveying to me, ever so kindly and delicately, the conviction that it was hardly wise to have had a fourth baby in our present circumstances. I don't suppose any one but a woman could understand the exact sharpness of the humiliation involved in giving birth to a baby, and having the cost of the proceeding defrayed by a person who doesn't exactly approve of it.

That was the fourth, and there hasn't been a fifth. I don't think I'm unusually selfish, or pleasure-loving, or shirking, or lacking in normal love for babies, or any of the things the average Catholic paper would tell me I am. I can't look without a heartache at the little robes folded away. But until circumstances alter with us, I can't face it again. What I would do if I had a husband who insisted on his rights, and sheltered himself behind pious platitudes, I don't know. Fortunately for me I happen to have a husband whose sensibilities are fine enough to sympathize with me, and who shares my ideals for the children.

For we have ideals. We don't want to have just children. We want strong, healthy, happy children, as nearly perfect as possible, in mind and body. We want to give them the best start that modern hygiene can give them. At present I have their complete confidence: I want sufficient leisure of mind and body to remain their friend and their playfellow, and not degenerate into a nagging, weary, provider of food and clothing. We want to give them the very best Catholic education procurable in the country: no makeshifts, no secondbests are good enough for our children. We want to help the boys grow into fine, sturdy men, men who will be straight in business, and whose contemporaries will respect them for their character and their abilities. We would like them to be proud of their Catholicism and to be able to answer an honest question about religion, honestly and rationally. We want them to be able and willing to serve Mass when the necessity arises, and in our inmost hearts, we cherish the hope of giving at least one priest to the service of the sanctuary, and of giving him freely and generously. We don't want him to have to go elsewhere for the wherewithal to go through the seminary.

We women are not really so very selfish and pleasure-loving. I work—hard—every day of my life; and I expect to go on doing it as long as my physical strength lasts out. Nor am I complaining about it. But I do want to see some result for all my labors. I want to sit back in the evening of my days, and rejoice in the children I have given to God and to my country. Of course I know they will always be as full of human faults as an egg is of meat, but they may be that, and still measure up to my ideals for them.

Why, oh why, do we not hear more in the Catholic Church of that birth control which is self-control, and which is based on chivalry and thought for the weak, and self-restraint, and all the knightly virtues? Why is it that the Church of a celibate and glorious priesthood, the Church of consecrated virgins, the Church which can keep young men virginal in the midst of a thousand tempta-

tions, the Church which so honors the Virgin Mother of God:—why is it that the spokesmen for this Church do not also inculcate self-restraint and Christian prudence after matrimony?

Some men, indeed, already have sufficient manliness and gentleness to see its necessity. But why should the Church not inculcate and encourage it in all her sons, and thus lighten the burdens of Catholic mothers, who in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, are striving with all their power to give worthy heirs to the Church of God?

Are Protestants Americans?

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

A RELIGIOUS weekly, the *Christian Register*, "a Journal of Free Churches," published in Boston, recently sent a questionnaire to several Protestant editors, and one Jewish, in this country. The questionnaire was inspired by the prospective candidacy of Governor Alfred E. Smith, of New York, for the Presidency of the United States. The answers, which it publishes in its issue of January 20, reveal a most astounding state of affairs. The *Register* informs us that the letters "may be taken as representative of the denominations in a large measure." Presumably, also, the writers of the letters may be taken as fairly representative of the level of intellectuality, citizenship and Christian charity in those denominations. Let them, therefore, speak for themselves.

The questions were two:

1. Do you believe that a devoted Roman Catholic could serve as President of the United States in unqualified loyalty to the avowed American principle of the equality of all religions before the law, and at the same time in unqualified loyalty to the avowed Roman Catholic doctrine of the relation of church and state?

2. Do you believe that the frank discussion of the religious issue involved in Governor Smith's candidacy would serve a good purpose at this time?

It must be admitted at the outset that the form of the first question, which is the only one that interests me here, severely handicapped the answerers, for it only too clearly indicated to them what they were expected to answer. Notice, also, that the framer of it cannily refrained from indicating what he considered to be "the avowed Roman Catholic doctrine of the relation of church and state." He makes no mention of "separation of church and state," but openly implies that "the avowed Roman Catholic doctrine" is naturally in opposition to the "avowed American principle of the equality of all religions before the law." Else why ask a question about them? Let us, however, charitably put all this down to a mental confusion, and inspect the answers to this extraordinary question. They are extremely self-revealing.

Three of the editors undoubtedly felt, however dimly, the unfairness of the question as put to them. Thus John van Schaick, Jr., Editor of the *Christian Leader* (Universalist), cleverly exposes the chicanery of it:

Can a devout Roman Catholic serve as President of the United States in unqualified loyalty to the avowed American principle of the equality of all religions before the law? Yes.

At the same time in unqualified loyalty to the avowed Roman

Catholic doctrine of the relation of church and state? I don't know. It is none of my business. All I, as a citizen and an elector, am concerned about is the first part of your question. How can I say "Yes"?

L. O. Hartman, Editor of *Zion's Herald* (Methodist Episcopal), answers:

In the abstract form in which your question number one, with its limiting phrase, "unqualified loyalty," which appears twice, is stated, the query in my opinion admits of only one answer—"No."

Nathan R. Melhorn, Editor of the *Lutheran* (Lutheran), makes distinctions also:

Query 1 is really permissive of two answers. I consider that a devoted Roman Catholic could serve as President of the United States in unqualified loyalty to the avowed American principle of the equality of all religions before the law. . . .

If by "unqualified loyalty" to the Roman Catholic doctrine you mean satisfying the hopes, even the desires, of the Vatican relative to this country, I do not believe that a Roman Catholic President would adjust the principles of this republic in any way.

This gentleman, however, seems to have some inside knowledge about the hopes and desires of the Vatican not shared by the rest of us. (Parenthetically, I am willing to make a fair "swap" of inside knowledge with him at any time he names.)

James E. Clarke, Editor of the *Presbyterian Advance* (Presbyterian), answers somewhat in the same vein of careful distinction, but he ends his letter with the words:

Hence no man can be at the same time absolutely loyal to the demands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the counter-demands of the Constitution of the United States.

It was probably because of these last words that the editor of the *Register* felt justified in heading his letter "Double Loyalty Impossible," with its (deliberate?) confusing of temporal and spiritual loyalties. It is this confusion, occurring so frequently, which makes Catholics so prone to doubt the good faith of those who are guilty of it. And apparently Catholics are not to be trusted when they explode that confusion and declare their temporal loyalty to the State and their spiritual loyalty to the Church. "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God, the things that are God's" (Mark, xii: 17).

The only answer, apart from the first quoted here, which shows any simultaneous comprehension of American principles and Catholic doctrines, was given by Leo Wise, Editor of the *American Israelite* (Jewish)—but what is he doing in this galley?

I believe [he says] that a devoted Roman Catholic could serve as President of the United States in unqualified loyalty to the avowed American principle of the equality of all religions before the law, and at the same time in unqualified loyalty to the avowed Roman Catholic doctrine of the relation of Church and State, which is one of absolute severance in the United States, whatever it may be in other countries.

Whereby Mr. Wise shows himself more enlightened than any other of his editorial confreres here gathered. Moreover, with a kind of prophetic foresight of the company he was to keep in the columns of the *Register*, he adds, somewhat bitterly:

I also believe that as matters now stand, no Roman Catholic,

however splendid his character and record, could be elected President of the United States.

In the following answer, E. M. Lawrence Gould, Editor of the *New Church Messenger* (Swedenborgian), completely explodes the claims of all Protestant churches to be the guide of the consciences and minds of their members, and thereby demolishes their very reason for existing as churches. (But perhaps what is not allowed to Catholics is permitted to Protestants?)

Inasmuch as the "Catholic" (*sic*) Church claims to be the divinely appointed custodian of its people's consciences, which most good men recognize as possessing for them an authority higher than that of any civil law, it would seem to follow that a Catholic who is consistent cannot honestly take the oath of office as President of the United States. For that matter, no strictly consistent Catholic could honestly take the oath of citizenship.

Which is as pretty and liberally sweeping a slander on the honesty of millions of our fellow-citizens as I have ever seen. (But Mr. Gould naively says they are merely "inconsistent.") And just suppose it might turn out that the Catholic Church is the Divinely appointed custodian of the consciences, not only of "its people," but of all people, including Mr. Gould's, where would Mr. Gould stand?

Of the ten remaining editors, three are simply non-committal: Amos R. Wells, Editor of the *Christian Endeavor World* (Interdenominational); James Boyd Hunter, Editor of the *Christian Intelligencer* (Reformed Church); and James R. Joy, Editor of the *Christian Advocate*, New York (Methodist). One, Sue C. Yerkes, Editor of the *Friends' Intelligencer*, answers simply, "No," but is careful to absolve her fellow-Quakers from her bigotry.

But I have kept the good wine for the last. William J. Reed, for instance, who is Editor of the *United Presbyterian* (Presbyterian), is quite unabashed in his intolerant un-Americanism. He says:

If the choice were between a Roman Catholic and a Protestant, I venture that United Presbyterians would be quite unanimous for the Protestant. My own feelings are strongly against a Romanist for President.

Evidently Mr. Reed does not let patriotism or intellectual convictions interfere with his feelings when he comes to vote. But, then, Catholics, as Mr. Belloc points out, are evidently the only old-fashioned ones nowadays who talk about convictions in practical matters.

Paul S. Leinbach, Editor of the *Reformed Church Messenger* (Reformed), and president of the Editorial Council of the Religious Press of America, sounds a deeper and more sinister note in his answer:

The record of the Roman Catholic Church, in the claim of the Papacy to temporal power (!), the attitude toward the public school system (?), and the apparent autocratic rejection of the claims of millions of American Christians to the right of self-government in religion as well as in politics (!!), makes membership in that organization a tremendous liability for any one who aspires to high political preferment. [Outside of "un-American" New York, of course.] . . . Constitutionally, we should not oppose any man because of his religious faith; yet it seems justifiable to many broad-minded (*sic*) Americans to question

the propriety of having a representative of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the White House. [Italics mine.]

This contrast between what is constitutional and what is proper is too laughable for words. Is that what "broad-mindedness" leads to? I wearily suppose, also, that it is useless to point out to Dr. Leinbach that the claim of the Papacy to "temporal power" refers to the lost domains in Italy, and in no way to any other country (I suppose he knows a little history); or to ask him what he conceives our attitude towards the public schools to be (something horrible, no doubt); or to ask him to read the columns of AMERICA to find out what Catholics have to say about self-government in politics. (Christ Himself took self-government in religion away from Christians.) Yet Dr. Leinbach must have some intelligence, or how did he become an editor?

Others, too, simply and serenely take for granted the old and oft-refuted slanders about "Papal pretensions." Thus Alva Martin Kerr, Editor of the *Herald of Gospel Liberty* (Christian), remarks:

So long as the Roman Catholic Church endeavors to maintain itself as a sort of super-sovereignty over the nations, as is evidenced both by its avowals and practices, the people of this Republic can never feel secure from the political machinations of this Church with one of its members as President.

Sometimes this old lie sports a little embroidery, as in the following answer from J. J. Wallace, Editor of the *Christian Advocate*, Pittsburgh (Methodist):

The form of question (1) compels me to answer, No. The loyalty could not be unqualified both ways, for the reason that the Roman Catholic Church stands for the religion of authority, and conceives the relation of church and state in such fashion as to inhibit the American principle. . . . The Pope's ambition for a seat in the League of Nations as a temporal ruler is only one indication of the fact that the Roman Church has not changed its view of the relation of church and state.

Apart from the fact that the Pope has repeatedly denied that his ambition is to have a seat in the League of Nations, this last sentence is all right. But possibly a Pope is not to be believed when he speaks of his ambitions? Or can it be really true that our position has never been comprehended by non-Catholics? Witness the following from Victor I. Masters, Editor of the *Western Recorder* (Southern Baptist):

No Roman Catholic who lives up to the requirement of that faith can give unqualified loyalty to the American principle of the equality of all religions before the law. The Roman Catholic doctrine on the relation of church and state is that of the subordination of the state to the Roman Catholic Church—this upon the assumption that it is the only true religion, the Roman Catholics being the judges.

And this last from William E. Gilroy, Editor of the *Congregationalist* (Congregational):

(1) Logically, no; but few men are strictly logical either in their politics or in their religion. . . . I can conceive of a devout Roman Catholic, broadly loyal to his Church, whose Americanism would be so strong that he might not follow his Church should any conflicting crisis arise. . . . If I were thoroughly convinced of the essential honesty, ability, and thorough-going democracy of a political leader, I would support him in spite of the fact that he was a Roman Catholic and in spite of the logical difficulty which I recognize as existing.

Both of these last two strike me as honestly convinced of the truth of what they say. Consequently they represent the difficulty we are faced with in its strongest form. Here it is. Starting from a false premise about the Church's political "pretensions," put forth originally as a mere polemic instrument, they unquestionably accept it, and that in spite of the fact that they must be aware that the Church strenuously denies that premise to be true. Even when they come across a pragmatic argument against it in the persons of loyal American Catholic statesmen and soldiers, instead of re-examining that premise, for instance by inquiring of Catholics, they merely conclude that these particular examples of loyal Catholics are exceptions, that they are "illogical" or "inconsistent."

This questionnaire has uncovered an extremely serious situation. Here are eleven exponents of thought in various sects, not including the Episcopal Church, who profess to believe that membership in the Catholic Church involves a dual civil and political allegiance, one to their Church and one to their country. Over and over again, in every possible way, officially and unofficially, the Church itself has told its members, and the world at large, that it demands no civil or political allegiance to itself, and commands its members, as a duty of conscience, to render that allegiance solely to their own Government or Constitution. That ought to be decisive. But, alas, it is not. Logically, these eleven could only reply affirmatively to a third question which was not expressly put to them:

3. Do you believe that the provision of the Constitution of the United States which states that no religious test shall be required of Federal officers should be repealed?

Three contingencies remain. Either we Catholics have been remiss in patiently explaining to non-Catholics the truth about the Church's doctrine of the relation of Church and State; or these editors, for instance, have not understood it when it was explained; or, calmly closing their eyes to the truth, and at the same time turning their backs on the principles of Americanism, they have deliberately chosen to run the risk of having put to them the question which heads this article.

LITTLE BY LITTLE

Little by little are great bridges builded;

Little by little are towers raised high;

Little by little the whole world is gilded

By the touch of the sun in the sky;

Little by little creep shoreward the billows;

Little by little come signs of Spring:

The gold on the gorse, and the green on the willows,

The stems of the trees and the blossoming.

Little by little the great cliffs crumble,

Little by little goes Winter's snow;

Little by little do mighty and humble

Fade into the years that onward flow.

Little by little experience moulds us;

Little by little the shadows fall,

The mystery deepens, and slumber enfolds us—

Dear God, we awake in the Judgment Hall.

P. J. O'CONNOR DUFFY.

Education

The Catholic College and the College for Catholics

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

AS the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore teaches in its Sixth Title, "The Church of God and the spirit of this world are locked in an awful and hotly contested combat over the education of youth." Like Hell, if one may venture upon a gruesome but not inapt comparison, the conflict is always beginning and never ending. For "men wholly inspired by a worldly spirit have left no effort untried to usurp the Church's office, received from Christ, of teaching Catholic youth, and to deliver it into the hands of civil society or subject it to the power of the secular Government." How well the secularists in the United States have succeeded is evidenced by the public-school system and the great State universities, as well as by a majority of the institutions of higher learning conducted under private auspices.

As a result Catholics and all who believe that a complete education must include religion, have been forced to battle fiercely for their principles. The struggle to maintain our colleges and universities on a par, so far as academic effectiveness is in question, with the publicly-supported and

richly-endowed private institutions has demanded a courage and perseverance truly heroic. Indeed were it not for their unshakeable confidence in Divine Providence Catholic educators would long ago have retired from a conflict that, from the human point of view, was and is unequal.

Hence it is easy to understand why Catholic educators have long been anxious to secure allies. In the past some

(whose devotion to Catholic education was above question) occasionally struck alliances which, on closer examination, were found to be fundamentally antagonistic to Catholic principles, or reconcilable only through reservations that were vague and distinctions of doubtful value. The disputes of the later 'eighties and early 'nineties, are not likely to be renewed; but like all honest quarrels they cleared the air. When Rome spoke, the discussion ended, as Bishop McQuaid wrote, and it then became every man's duty to obey. More recently we have indulged in other differences of opinion. It would indeed be a strabismic world in which every man strained to see eye to eye with his neighbor; contrary to a common persuasion, Catholics are singularly free from this strain.

A. ORGANIZATION.

Catholic College

1. A system of education joined to "the Catholic Faith and power of the Church" is maintained in every department. Its principles in philosophy, theology, ethics, pedagogy, and in every human activity, are exclusively those approved by the Catholic Church. This system does not concern itself solely or even primarily with the knowledge of natural things, or with the ends of social life. On the contrary, it assigns the chief place to religious and moral training.

(Cf. *Syllabus of Pius IX, Prop. 48; Canon 1372 of the Code.*)

2. To expel from education the authority of the Church exposes youth to loss of Faith.—(*Pius IX to the Archbishop of Freiburg, July 14, 1864.*)

3. "Our Divine religion [must] be the soul of the entire academic education."—(*Brief of Pius IX to the Bishops of Ireland, March 20, 1854.*)

College for Catholics

1. The college may style itself "non-sectarian" (for reasons cited under A, 2), but while it bows to the authority of the Church, it does not formally and directly teach Catholic doctrines in every department. Its professors are supposed to present the truth in their respective fields as they see it.

2. No religious test is required from professors, trustees, or students, although ultimate control is vested in a governing body the majority of whose members must be Catholics.

3. Care is taken that nothing contrary to Faith or morals be taught in any department. But professors are not formally bound to make "our Divine religion . . . the soul of the entire academic education," since they may be ignorant of its teachings, or may reject them.

B. PURPOSE.

1. The purpose of the Catholic college is "to educate the young zealously in letters and science, according to the mind of the Catholic Church, the pillar and guarantee of truth." (*Id.*)

2. "Let all branches of learning expand in the closest alliance with religion." (*Id.*)

3. Let "all types of study be enlightened by the bright rays of Catholic truth." (*Id.*)

1. The purpose of the college for Catholics is to afford the student an education in letters and science. "The mind of the Catholic Church" is recognized as "the guarantee of truth"; but when heads of departments or professors are non-Catholics, the test cannot be invariably or uniformly applied.

2. See A, 3, and B, 1.

3. See A, 3, and B, 1.

C. FACULTY.

1. Professors must be chosen who are "models of well-doing in their teaching and in their integrity of life." (*Id.*)

2. Professors "should have nothing more at heart than to fashion with all care the minds of young men to the practice of religion, to uprightness of conduct, and all virtuous dealing." (*Id.*)

1. Professors are chosen for outstanding ability in investigation and teaching, without reference to other than conventional standards of personal conduct.

2. To further the religious and moral progress of the students is not the duty of the professors, but of those members of the faculty who are clergymen, or of one of their number appointed for that purpose.

We are so united in fundamentals that we can swing battle-axes at one another all day, and kneel to say the Rosary together at night. It is one of the countless advantages of a vocation to the Faith that we can take

ourselves seriously, in the justified confidence that if we take ourselves too seriously, Rome will correct us.

Following these encounters another sort of alliance has been proposed. It has not been carried into effect, as far as I know, but it is talked of, and is certainly *quid novum et nefandum*. This alliance proposes an institution which is not "a Catholic college," but "a college for Catholics."

In this cold weather my wits move slowly, like Mark Twain's fly in a saucer of molasses, but the phrase should stand analysis.

In my judgment, the one college that is proper and fit for Catholic students is the college founded and conducted according to the principles set forth in Pontifical decrees and in the Canon Law. Peculiar conditions may justify the toleration of an institution in which one or other of the requisites is wanting; but this is toleration, not approval. The only college which the Church approves for her sons and daughters is the college conforming in every essential detail to the plans which she prescribes. It seems to follow, then, that in the mind of the Church the Catholic college is the college for Catholics, and none other.

If "the college for Catholics," as distinguished in this new proposal from "the Catholic college," accepts these plans in substance, but with a change of name, the difference is one of words. If it does not accept them, then, as it seems to me, it is neither a Catholic college, nor a college for Catholics, nor a secularized college. In time it may be one or the other, or even the third; but at present it hangs between the solid ground of Catholic principle and the shifting haze of theory like Mahomet's coffin.

On the preceding page, I have tried to list what appear to be the main differences (leaving other phases of the proposal for subsequent discussion) between the Catholic college and the college for Catholics. To me these differences are fundamental, but upon that judgment I invite criticism.

Sociology

An Appeal to the War Veterans

DONALD BANKS

DURING the World War the United States Government insured against death and permanent and total disability more than four and a half-million men and women of the service. At this time there are but few more than a half-million policies in effect. This includes the hundred and some odd thousand who are still carrying their term (war-time) insurance. At one time the total value of these policies was thirty-nine billions of dollars. At the present time the total value of the policies in effect is approximately two and three-quarter billions of dollars.

Let us see what the United States Government has to offer in the way of insurance to the ex-service population. It is the cheapest and safest insurance that can be pur-

chased; it pays dividends; it allows a grace period for paying premiums; it has a cash value after the policy has been in force for one year; it has a paid-up insurance feature at the end of the same period; it has a loan value; there is no extra charge for the permanent and total disability features. The insured has three options of settlement upon maturity of the policy. These options are as follows: insurance payable in one sum; insurance payable in elected installments; insurance payable in installments throughout life. United States Government life insurance is free from restrictions as to residence, travel, occupation, military or naval service. The proceeds of insurance are exempt from all taxation and shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of the insured or creditors of any beneficiary to whom the proceeds may be awarded, except claims of the United States arising under the War Risk Insurance Act or the World War Veterans' Act. No premiums are charged during total and permanent disabilities. The following types of policies are available: ordinary life; twenty-payment life; thirty-payment life; twenty-year endowment; thirty-year endowment; endowment at age of 62; and the five-year convertible-term policy. The amount of insurance plus dividend accumulations, less any indebtedness, becomes payable in monthly installment of \$5.75 per thousand, payable as long as the insured remains permanently and totally disabled, even though such disability may continue for more than 240 months. At any time within five years from the date the policy takes effect it may be exchanged, in accordance with regulations, for a policy of the same amount bearing the same date, with premiums based on the same age, on any plan of level premium (converted) insurance issued by the United States Veterans' Bureau. In case of a change to a policy issued at a lower premium rate, medical evidence of good health is required. The premiums paid by the holders of converted insurance policies are deposited and covered into the Treasury to the credit of the United States Government life-insurance fund. All total and permanent disability claims and death claims which are traceable to the hazards of the military or naval service are borne by the United States and do not affect the Government life-insurance fund. Veterans may reinstate all or any part of the term (war-time) insurance in multiples of five hundred dollars, but not less than one thousand dollars. Necessary medical examinations are made without charge at any of the offices of the United States Veterans' Bureau. Recent legislation has authorized the issuance of a five-year convertible-term policy. This policy provides for a level premium term-rate for a period of five years and thereafter beginning with the first day of the sixty-first month, the premium-rate required for an ordinary life policy at the then attained age of the insured. This policy is recommended for purchase by those who find it temporarily inconvenient to pay the higher premium on other forms of converted policies. The premium rates for this policy approximate the premium rate on the term or war-time policy. Another feature added by recent legislation is to

the effect that ex-service men with service connected disabilities, and who are not permanently and totally disabled, may reinstate and convert their insurance without paying all back premiums if they are not financially able to do so.

One would think that the many advantages listed here would be sufficient for the ex-service man to reinstate and hold tight to his Government life insurance. The figures quoted in the beginning of this article do not indicate that the ex-service men are doing this. It has been stated that life insurance is sold, not bought. Unfortunately, Congress has not set aside any funds for the sale of this insurance. Last year about this time the United States Veterans' Bureau conducted a drive of publicity to acquaint the ex-service men with their rights concerning reinstatement and conversion. At that time, the final date for such reinstatement and conversion was set by Congress as July 2, 1926. This has been extended to July 2, 1927, and it is not believed Congress will authorize any further extensions. It is necessary, therefore, for the ex-service men to act before July 2, 1927.

If one were to stop but a moment to consider the need and reason for the existence of so many charitable organizations and realize the advantages of life insurance, improvidence would be lessened. In this country of ours there is too great a need for alms-houses and orphanages. This need can be reduced by life insurance. The safest and least expensive of life insurance is offered to the ex-service population by the United States Government. Has not some one said that life insurance is the most certain contract known to man? Here is a life-insurance contract backed up by the United States Government. Nothing could be more secure. Life insurance companies and life underwriters, practically without exception, urge the ex-service men and women to carry this Government insurance. What a lasting memory the soldiers will leave their sons and daughters if this provision is made for their start in life.

Full and complete advice and information concerning this insurance will be furnished upon inquiry by letter, telephone or personal contact, at any of the offices of the United States Veterans' Bureau.

The President of the United States, under date of January 15, 1927, issued a proclamation as follows:

Wherefore, I, Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States, do hereby designate the period January 31 to February 7, 1927, as a time during which special effort should be made to inform all veterans of the World War of the right they have to reinstate lapsed war risk life insurance and to convert it into United States Government life insurance; and, that all such veterans may, in some manner, be properly informed, I urge all citizens, particularly employers, the press, labor organizations, women's associations, professional groups and civic and patriotic bodies, to secure full information and use such means of informing the veterans as may be most effective.

In view of the large number of early deaths among the ex-service population, it is to be hoped that as much as possible of this insurance will be reinstated and converted before it is too late.

With Scrip and Staff

MARRIAGE, says Will Durant in the February *Century*, "has well-nigh disappeared; or if not quite that, it has been abbreviated at either end, by deferment and divorce." Does, however, the mere advantage of being up-to-date compensate for the practical complications—saying nothing of the spiritual disasters—that walk in, once the sacrament instituted by Christ has been shown the door? Even if the knot tied by God has been sundered, there still must be unravelled the fearful tangle of alimony. The sob-stories ignore this problem. How it can puzzle even the wisest legal brains is shown by Dorothy Dunbar Bromley in the February *Harper's*. Ex-Governor Fielder of New Jersey, now of the New Jersey Court of Chancery, tells her:

Even though the wife may have a profession or a good business of her own, the husband shouldn't necessarily be let off scot-free. . . . I can imagine a case when it would be right for a woman to collect alimony from her first husband even after she has remarried.

Justice Charles L. Guy, of the New York Supreme Court, even though claimed as sympathetic to feminism, agrees that husbands should be kept under financial control. Yet Justice Selah B. Strong, also of the New York Supreme Court, finds it "almost unbelievable that a right-minded woman without children will accept support from a man she has ceased to love and live with"; and a judge who had handled five thousand such cases remarked that "if the woman had been willing to make certain adjustments and sacrifices the couple would not be in the divorce courts." The Editor's Easy Chair, also of *Harper's*, is not satisfied that the Church should "hold together people who do not wish to stay united and as to whom there is no compelling reason why they should." The law of God and the sanctity of the home may not seem to him compelling reasons. Still, if the "way out" is to be through the jungle of divorce and alimony proceedings—if womankind is now to be divided into "old-fashioned wives-and-mothers, professional women, and gold-diggers," or, to use the terms, the matrimonial, the parsimonial, and the alimonial—then something may yet be said for an institution which bids them try some "adjustments and sacrifices" with the help of God's grace.

HOW people can be educated to those responsibilities without religious teaching I find it hard to see. It is the lack of such religious teaching which is at the root of the whole situation that Mr. Durant so bitterly laments in the paper just mentioned—the lack, too, of those principles of scholastic ethics which in his recent book he finds beneath his notice. "Religious education," reports the Federal Council of Churches in January, "conceived in a broad sense, is the supreme task of the Church in our generation." It surely is: though if nothing can be found "broad" enough to be taught to the whole world as an unquestioned fact, then religious education will get no further than its starting-point.

WITH the ideal of union in view, Dr. W. W. Peet, *Literature* the representative of the Federal Council of Churches in the Near East, tells of his efforts to "establish mutual confidence and goodwill between the Eastern Churches and the Churches of the West." This coming year, however, will recall the memory of those two brothers who, in a time of strife and suspicion, did establish unity in the East in the only way that it may be established in any part of the world, by union with the center of Christian Unity in the West: Saints Cyril and Methodius, Apostles of the Slavs. The eleventh centenary year of St. Cyril is to commence on February 14 of this year, as announced by the Bishops of Yugoslavia, in a joint letter to their people. A Slavic pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Methodius in Velehrad, Moravia, and another to that of St. Cyril in Rome, are announced by the Bishops for 1927, and precisely at that time, suitable celebrations are to be held throughout all Yugoslavia. The example they set is the strongest pledge of unity.

JUST as religious union requires unity in religious teaching, so, too, the pacifists longing for world-brotherhood have difficulty in finding any common moral basis for men to come together on. The Federal Council of Churches offers the "national renunciation of war as a legitimate method for settling international disputes." But even when war is "renounced," as we should like to renounce it, what will keep men from asserting their real or supposed rights, unless they know just what their rights are? Mr. Dan B. Brummitt, one of the recent visitors to President Calles in Mexico, tells us that law observance will come about "in proportion as we educate the individual to say, 'I gladly surrender some of my rights for the sake of a better social life.'" To renounce the exercise of one's rights is one thing—which thing, by the way is precisely what those Religious do "for the sake of a better social life" whom Mr. Calles so objects to; but to *surrender one's rights* is quite a different matter. Still more, to surrender all idea of any individual rights; rights of parents over their children, rights of personal liberty or freedom of worship, and to turn them over to a sovereign State. "Young people all over the world," cries Mr. Walter W. Van Kirk, "are in a state of almost chronic revolt against the complacency of their elders toward war." The PILGRIM has not been over enough of the world to check up on this: most of the young people I have met seem to enjoy a good fight; however, there is plenty of pacifist agitation in our secular colleges. At the National Students' Conference in Milwaukee, on New Year's Day, which was attended by 2,500 students, the international-mindedness of these students was everywhere in evidence. To be internationally-minded—to learn to restrain the exercise of our rights by considerations of higher justice and Christian charity—is a blessing. But if the "surrender of our rights" is to be the basis of international peace, our students should receive sane enlightenment as to whom they are about to surrender them.

THE PILGRIM.

The Passing of a Valiant Woman

SISTER M. ELEANORE, C.S.C.

MANY years ago, before the family sitting-room threatened to become an obsolete institution, some modest little books appeared under the title "Family Sitting-Room Series." In one of these books is a sentence which those of us who were friends of the author, Katherine Eleanor Conway, must, now that she has left us, sorrowfully and yet, as always, gratefully apply to her.

"It sometimes happens that a woman may have one friend or several who come to her with the respect, affection and confidence with which they would approach a cherished sister; while she, in turn, is perfectly easy and devoid of self-consciousness in their society, rejoices disinterestedly in their successes, sympathizes with their troubles, and out of a heart and mind unvexed by fears of loss or desire of possession, counsels, comforts and uplifts; or, as need arises, gives reciprocal confidence and seeks reciprocal counsel."

Long before Miss Conway wrote this book, "Making Friends and Keeping Them," she had learned both the theory and the practice of her art. Many friends there are to mourn the kind, loyal, valiant woman who on January 4, 1927, was laid to rest in the habit of the Third Order of St. Francis. With the same big generosity of spirit that sent the young Assisian scampering through the streets after a beggar to load the astonished man with money, Miss Conway scattered her bounty to the poor when times were prosperous for her, and when they were not, she gave her mite as did the widow in the Gospel.

The bounty of Miss Conway was manifested not only in the giving of material gifts but also in the giving of the more precious gifts of mind and heart. I wish I knew how many writers there are in America who can say as I can that never one line of theirs braved the public eye without its word of commendation or of gentle criticism from the gallant little woman in Boston. From her citadel of pain—for during these past nine years her body has been twisted out of human semblance by a most agonizing disease of the bone—she has kept watch over literary ventures and has sent out her message of loving encouragement with an exact intuition for its need.

Those who knew Miss Conway must agree with a characterization of her by John Boyle O'Reilly, who discovered her genius for the world. "She is a poet and logician; she has the heart of a woman and the brain of a man." Her character is a rare combination "of strength and tenderness, of wide, clear intellectual comprehension and of a poetic and deeply spiritual temperament." She was artistic without being temperamental in the wearing sense of the term. She was a woman who bore many griefs but who never acquired a grievance. She used to say that she had no sense of humor, but those who met her during her long years of suffering found that it had developed with adversity. Her bravery in the face of

constant pain had certainly something of the laughter of saints in it, for it was an understanding bravery that looked across the misted years into the glory of light beyond. Surely at the end of her street there are stars and sunrise and glory of rest in peace.

Miss Conway was often asked by her friends the rebellious question, "Why must *you* bear all this pain?" And her answer—such a complete, satisfying answer to the person of faith—was invariably, "God and my confessor know." If not for her sins, as we who love her like to think, then for the sins of the world, pain was a trifling price for her to pay that they might be atoned for with some slight measure of justice. The world needs the slow martyrdom of brave ones like her to weigh in the balance with itself against Divine Justice. God manifested one of His exquisite thoughtfulnesses toward those who will allow themselves to become His chosen friends when He called her to Himself on the beautiful Feast of the Most Holy Name. She had an adoring devotion to the Sacred Name of Our Saviour, which she satisfied daily by reading the Psalms that hymn the praises of the Name of Jesus.

Katherine Eleanor Conway was born in Rochester, New York, on September 6, 1852. She wrote her first poem at the age of fifteen. She began her literary and journalistic career on the Rochester *Daily Union and Advertiser*. The attention of Boston was first attracted to her when she wrote the poem "Remember" and submitted it to John Boyle O'Reilly, editor of the *Pilot*. Mr. O'Reilly recognized her talent and engaged her to work on his staff. From 1883 to 1908 she served as associate editor of the *Pilot*.

Miss Conway's fame was gradually spreading. In 1907 she was awarded the Laetare Medal, given annually by the University of Notre Dame to some member of the Catholic laity for service to religion, art, science, philanthropy, or other public work. In 1912 the attention of the Catholic world was directed toward her. Pope Pius X bestowed the *Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice* Medal upon her for distinguished services to the Church. Few women have received such recognition. Miss Conway was at this time a professor of English literature and of Church history at St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana. With delegations from all over the nation and the entire student body in proud attendance, Miss Conway was awarded the medal, which had been brought from Rome by the late Very Rev. Andrew Morrissey, C.S.C., D.D., then Provincial of the Order of the Holy Cross in America. Accompanying the medal was a diploma signed by His Eminence Cardinal Merry del Val and a photograph of Pope Pius X with an autographed message.

Of Miss Conway's years at St. Mary's, from 1911 to 1915, it is difficult for me to say anything. The joys of remembering them are too much akin to pain just now. Her little room was a gathering place for literary aspirants, of course, but it was more than that; it was a gathering place of friends. Despite the fact that she protested a lack of humor, many little half-forgotten laughs lurk in the corners of that room. There was the day, forlorn

example, when I happened into the room to find her without her glasses, which was almost like finding her *en déshabille* in that room. She chuckled a bit when I came close to her and then uttered this dubious compliment, "I should like to go without my glasses all the time, for I saw you surrounded by a rosy mist which made you really beautiful."

Miss Conway was intensely religious. She had a keen understanding of the purpose of human life and the necessity of every one's discovering and following the particular vocation offered her by God. Only those who knew her could realize how fully she understood her own vocation of literary leadership among Catholics. Her appreciation of the life of the religious was entire and beautiful. On the occasion of my religious profession, which occurred after she had found it necessary to leave St. Mary's because of her failing health, she wrote me a letter, which is so characteristic of this appreciation and of her own lovely inner life as to justify quotation here.

"What shall I say to you on this best day of all your earthly days! If I were near you, I could touch your hand and look at you; and you would know what is in my heart for you. I have thought of you very often since last May. Perhaps I was getting ever so faintly the sound of the approaching footsteps of the Beautiful One in His robe, walking in the greatness of His strength, to make you His own in the surest way forever. Oh, today, when your word is so powerful with Him, crowd in just one little petition for me! I join my congratulations to those of the dear ones with you today. Look for a long letter from me when I am a bit stronger."

Many long letters came in the years from that time till her death, though she did not become "a bit stronger." Neither of us suspected then the *via dolorosa* that she must tread before she heard the footsteps of the Beautiful One coming to take her to be His own forever.

Miss Conway was the daughter of cultured Catholic parents who came to this country from the west of Ireland. Upon her mother's side are traditions of scholarship for many generations, several of her kinsmen having been prominent ecclesiastics. The name is of remote Welsh origin and there is a slight trace of English in the family, but they gloried in their Irish blood. Miss Conway was educated by the Religious of the Sacred Heart in Rochester and at St. Mary's Academy, Buffalo, New York, where her inclinations to literature were strengthened by a gifted teacher. Her busy mind was ever instinctively reaching out toward wider activities, and she found an able assistant in her friend and adviser, Bishop McQuaid of Rochester, New York. She edited for five years the *West End Journal*, a religious monthly. From 1880-1883 she was assistant editor of the *Catholic Union and Times*.

Miss Conway was founder of the John Boyle O'Reilly Reading Circle and was for more than eighteen years its president. She was a member of the New England Women's Press Association, the Boston Author's Club, the League of Catholic Women, the Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association, and the Children of Mary. She was

known in Boston for her charitable works as well as for her literary ones.

The literary output of Miss Conway's fine, energetic genius is one of which the Catholic world may well be proud. Two of her best-known works are a novel, "Lalor's Maples" and her "Watchwords from John Boyle O'Reilly." It is sad that her editorial articles must share the fate of their kind, and yet, since they served their timely purpose, we must let them be forgotten as are all voices that cry in the wilderness, once the wilderness has been penetrated by friend and foe alike. Her book of poems, "A Dream of Lilies," aroused expectations which were amply fulfilled. Another volume of poems was in preparation for publication when the author's tireless hands were stilled by death.

Miss Conway's works abide a living monument to her. We are grateful that so much has been left to us. There was always a wistful note of otherworldliness in her writings, as there was always a vision of Heaven in her eyes.

REVIEWS

The Catholic Church and History. By HILAIRE BELLOC. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.00.

In this third volume of the Calvert Series, the general editor contributes an apologetic treatise of substantial merit, despite its small compass. Mr. Belloc does not concern himself with the positive thesis that history bears testimony to the rightness of the Catholic claim. His purpose is that of refuting the charge that history can be used as a weapon to batter down the dogma that the Catholic Church is of Divine origin. As developed in the non-Catholic tradition, history furnishes two main arguments against the Church: the moral argument and the intellectual. As stated by Mr. Belloc, the moral argument contends that the Church has made official pronouncements which history has later proved false, that the Church, knowing the falsity of these pronouncements, has continued to teach them, and that the Church, because it is an organized society, cannot be divinely authorized. In the intellectual argument against the Church, he differentiates the Protestant and the sceptical versions. The Protestant appeal to history against the Church admits an original Divine revelation, but declares that the Church has corrupted this and made of it something essentially human. The sceptical appeal denies even the original revelation and asserts that the Catholic Church is wholly and completely a man-made organization. Taking these errors as the fundamental theses of the non-Catholic historical position, Mr. Belloc refutes them soundly and brilliantly. By direct denial, by lucid logic, by brilliant analysis, by specific and general examples, he marshals all of his remarkable talents to a splendid defense of the Catholic claim that the Church was founded by God and remains, through God, an infallible teacher.

A. T. P.

Adventures on the Borderland of Ethics. By RICHARD C. CABOT. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$2.00.

Technically ethics is the science of objective right and wrong in human conduct. By extension it emphasizes the proprieties, amenities and courtesies of life. Of late the extended signification is receiving much attention and it is largely from this angle that this volume whose five essays are reprints from the *Survey Graphic*, approaches the subject. Dr. Cabot aims to record briefly the more interesting conclusions he has come to about practical ethics from long professional association with clergymen, medicos, business men, teachers and social workers. His first chapter is an earnest plea that theological students be given a year of super-

vised pastoral work as part of their seminary curriculum, somewhat after the internship of doctors. His argument is clear, pointed and convincing. When most institutions for paupers, the sick and the insane were under Catholic control something akin to this was not uncommon and many priests still undergo a similar apprenticeship. Discussing "Ethics and Education," Dr. Cabot stresses the importance of formal ethics' courses for the schools and in elaborating his idea draws a nice distinction between teaching ethics and teaching about ethics. The whole paper is implicitly a justification for the religious schools. Of business men, he significantly remarks that they commonly hesitate to pronounce things right or wrong but take refuge for what they do under "trade customs, legal enactments and individual feelings" which "are not sufficient guides to conduct in business—or anywhere else." Apropos of his assertion that, to his knowledge, medical ethics is not systematically taught in any medical school, it might be noted that practically every Catholic medical college offers and prescribes such a course and that it includes a discussion of just such problems as he singles out for treatment. One may not subscribe to all that Dr. Cabot holds, but his book is a timely exposition of certain phases of ethical practice which no professional worker can afford to overlook.

W. I. L.

Fifty Famous Painters. By HENRIETTA GERWIG. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

This little handbook offers a very readable description of the life and traits of fifty famous painters from the time of Giotto to the present day. Miss Gerwig has shown no small skill in her selection of biographical anecdotes, and even for those who have had little concern with art or paintings there is an abundance of attractive reading matter. The author professes to present nothing new, but rather to meet a popular demand for such a series of selected bits of information, suitable, for instance, for school use. The sketch of each painter is accompanied by an illustration of one of his works. To avoid expense the illustrations necessarily had to be rather weak in color, but they may at least excite interest. At the close there is a brief reading-list. It is to be hoped that readers will be inclined to make use of this list, since it will help to supplement what is always the defect of handbooks of this nature, so multiplied at the present day. The difficulty with what may be termed so much popular *external* information about works of art and their authors is that it gives a certain sense of knowledge, without really giving insight into the secrets of the artist's production. Even for those who are mere amateurs, caring nothing for technical matters, it is possible to get away from the idea of a painting merely as a picturesque object done by a picturesque individual, and to learn to look for the painter's real purpose—religious devotion, or expression of contemplation, or technical display, and so on—and see how a certain set of ideals and traditions have combined with his personal traits of character to produce a given result. Hence, the somewhat artificial character of most groupings of painters by country or period. Miss Gerwig's characterizations of our modern American painters are fresh and true to life.

J. L. F.

Anthology of Magazine Verse for 1926. Edited by WILLIAM STANLEY BRAITHWAITE. Boston: B. J. Brimmer Company. \$4.00.

In this, his fourteenth annual anthology and yearbook of American poets, poetry and poetics, Mr. Braithwaite gives new evidence that he is a necessary, and even indispensable, factor in clarifying the muddled poetic ferment of the day. He does not attempt to distill the pure poetic essence of the year's compound, nor does he succeed in sublimating the important tendencies among the poets. He merely compresses into a single book (which, it may be noted, is acquiring considerable bulk) selections from the overwhelming volume of magazine publications. This is no small contribution to the annals of poetic history; but it leaves the student in almost as perplexed a state of mind as he was before examining the anthology. It is impossible that there could

have been 500 pages of superior poetry published in 1926; and superior poetry alone should find a place in an anthology. Since Mr. Braithwaite fills 500 pages of his volume with verse, it would follow that this verse is not all distinctive. And that is true. Some of his selections are distressingly bad; a large number are neutral; but a few are so superbly exquisite that they justify the whole book. However, this criticism is not precisely just, for Mr. Braithwaite does not characterize his volume as a collection of the best poems but as the selected poems of the year. These are so many and so varied that comment on them is a hopeless task. In addition to his reprints of poems, Mr. Braithwaite enlarges his volume with a tremendous amount of information that is acceptable. In part one, he has gathered a series of articles by diverse authorities on phases of poetic history in the United States. One group of this series surveys the poetry of the country according to geographical boundaries; the other group examines the poetic contributions made by those of certain racial stocks or of religious affiliation. Thus, in this portion, is printed a representative essay on "The Catholic Poets of the United States," by Thomas Walsh. This symposium is a new feature of the volume, as it is also one of the interesting features. The usual record of the poems and books published during the year has been augmented by a list of "the best books" on poetic matters that have been issued since 1912. The volume concludes with "A Biographical Dictionary of Poets in the United States." This dictionary is designated as the "First Series"; that may explain the notable absences in it, though it does not entirely solve the question of inclusions. In such a large book and in such a comprehensive table of contents, Mr. Braithwaite cannot avoid arousing some adverse criticism. Nevertheless, he has incorporated so many commendable qualities in his anthology that we could scarcely do without it in the study of contemporary poets.

F. X. T.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Humorous Dramatic Acts.—That the self-sufficient Bernard Shaw is not entirely without gratitude is evidenced by the fact that he includes as the first and longest selection in his latest book, "Translations and Tomfooleries" (Brentano, \$2.25), the play "Jitta's Atonement," by the Austrian author, Siegfried Trebitsch, who translated his works into German. Trebitsch is duly grateful for this act of gratitude, even though his play is changed by Shaw into something that differs markedly from the original. Neither the original play nor the loose translation is a satisfying drama; the glorification of infidelity is morally, and therefore artistically, false. In the six one-act pieces that follow, Mr. Shaw insists, and again insists, that he is being funny. He fears that he may be suspected of being serious. The plays are genuine "tomfooleries." They have in them a sufficient basis of reality on which to build the superstructure of absurdity and extravaganza. And they manifest the remarkable genius of Mr. Shaw in satirizing and making absurd whatever he does not admire. For the major part, these playlets are acceptable nonsense.

The author of the famous "Hobson's Choice," Harold Brighouse, has offered five pleasant little one-act plays in his "Open-Air Plays" (French, \$1.60). The first four use royalty for their characters. "Maypole Morning" presents Charles II in a contention against the Puritans; he carries off a marriage, as does Queen Elizabeth, also the champion of merriment, in "The Laughing Mind." In both of these plays, as in "The Prince Who Was a Piper" and "The Rational Princess," there is clever repartee and pleasant humor. "How the Weather Is Made" is a fantasia in which the months are impersonated by females, thus explaining the waywardness of the weather.

Splendid Priests.—The sympathetic pen of Georges Goyau, of the French Academy, gives us in "Cardinal Mercier" (Longmans, \$1.25) a sketch of that very distinguished prelate and statesman, emphasizing particularly the two great interests of

his life, his work for the furtherance of Thomism at Louvain and his efforts toward Church reunion. At the same time, his other priestly and civic activities are not slighted, especially his efforts during the war on behalf of his suffering country. Viscount Halifax writes the preface.

An addition to the series known as "The Splendid Books" which will have particular interest for Catholics is that introduced and edited by James J. Walsh under the title "These Splendid Priests" (Sears, \$1.25). In this volume Dr. Walsh has collected short sketches of nearly a dozen priests who are worthy of note because of some pioneering achievement, whether that may have been in exploration, in missionary heroism, in education, science, or in social and religious endeavor. Thus, the list is headed by St. Benedict and ended with the name of the nineteenth century paleontologist, Rev. John MacEnery, including between these two the names of St. Vincent de Paul and of several Franciscan and Jesuit missionaries. As issued, the volume is a compilation of interesting documents illustrative of the courage and the vision of the priestly pioneers. But because of the effort to include in it these documentary curiosities, the compilation suffers. Thus Bancroft's account of Serra must be supplemented by Father Engelhardt's narrative, and the selections from Dryden's translation of Bouhours' lives of Ignatius and Francis Xavier are incomplete. In the introduction, the author has tripped in some of his dates, for example, in making Serra and Lobo contemporaries, and in placing the travels of Jogues and Marquette at about the same time.

Volumes and Volumes of Verse.—A short time ago, a gentleman who had achieved notice enough to have several of his poems included in the anthologies asserted that he had abandoned poetry, that he considered verse-making a waste of energy and time, that verse served no good purpose save that of filling a hole in a magazine, and other like heresies. Perhaps, his repugnance to verse was occasioned by the perusal of some modern collections of so-called poetry; if so, his distaste for the noble art would be well explained. In the dreary pages of these contemporary volumes one searches in vain for a convincing thought emotionally expressed, for the novel perception of an old thought, and, not infrequently, for a poem that is technically correct. "Ports of Call," by Lena Whittaker Blakeney, is not quite so poor in its poetic content as its companion volumes. It has, at least, ease and clearness and creates some interest through its descriptive passages. "Poems," by Faith Wadsworth Collins, shows an occasional flash of imagination in its nature poems, but its ballads are rudely conceived. "Dust and Spray," by Harold Leland Chaffey, scarcely once rises above the ordinary perceptiveness with which a tree or the sea would be expressed. "Wind Tossed Leaves," by Victor Zarin, contains some striking titles, and a variety of lurid words found only in the dictionary. "Faust in Spring Time," by Angela Marco, is best in its sonnets, but these are questionable poetry. "Mystery and Other Poems," by Martha A. Boughton, has some reverent references to nature, but is lacking in inspiration as in workmanship. All of the volumes named above are published by Harold Vinal, New York. Among the offerings of Dorrance and Company, Philadelphia, no superior poets are to be discovered. "Rosemary," by Lilian Sue Keech, gives evidence of some readings of poetry and some imitations of the masters. "Rhymes and Lines," by Ellen Gordon Cameron, offers few thoughts that haunt the mind, but many lines that offend the musical ear. "My Neighbors and Other Poems," by Herbert C. Shaw, teaches the need of charity and forbearance. "Flaming Candlelight," by Mary Edgar Comstock, is not without a touch of grace and delicacy. "Indian Rhapsodies," by Richard J. Boardman, philosophizes on the nature of the aborigines in halting meters. One regrets that the quality of contemporary verse is not more artistic and more inspired. Still, such volumes as these increase the sum of happiness that the friends of the author enjoy.

Communications

The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department.

Our Debt to Mexico

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The letter on "What New York Catholics Owe to Mexico" in your number of December 15 was interesting to me because of a similar situation in our city. If compound interest at 6 per cent were figured on the contribution of \$4,920 which the pastor of the first Catholic church in New York City, then in difficulties, received from Mexicans about 140 years ago, it would now amount to over ten million dollars. Surely the Catholics of New York have a debt of honor to their co-religionists in Mexico.

When the first Bishop of Milwaukee, the Rt. Rev. John Martin Henni, came to Milwaukee the only church in this city was a small frame chapel entirely inadequate for the needs of his rapidly growing flock of poor immigrants. So the Bishop made a collection tour of Cuba and Mexico in 1850 to secure money for building a cathedral. This was only a few years after our war with Mexico. The amount collected is not shown in the old records, but the tour is said to have been successful and no doubt made possible the erection of St. John's Cathedral which serves to this day.

Is it not possible that the old records of many other dioceses in this country will bring forth similar stories that could be collected and put in such shape as to bring home to the Catholics of this country the obligation we are under to the Church in Mexico? Would not the best way to repay this debt be if every Bishop would take into his seminary one or more Mexican students for the priesthood, looking forward to the day when peace will come to the Church in that country and its greatly reduced clergy will have an enormous work before it?

Milwaukee.

FRANK GROSS, JR.

The Negro in the Church

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have read with deep interest the series of four papers contributed recently to your columns by the Rev. John LaFarge, S.J., concerning the Negro in the Church. I feel that the writer of these papers has merited the congratulations of the whole Catholic population, and especially of the Negro portion of it, in asking a hearing from the public upon this sadly neglected subject. I think that Father LaFarge is logical in connecting up the present unfortunate state of the Catholic Negro with what he shows to have been a failure in Catholic missionary efforts among colored people in the United States up to the present time. I should like to add, however, another word by way of explanation to show why missionary efforts, as conducted in the past, have failed to fructify.

The success of the efforts of any missionary group depends upon their ability to develop their charges so that they can be looked upon as no longer subject to pure tutelage, but as ready to take their place in the struggle for faith and country with the rest of the Catholic world. Unless there can be such gradual change in attitude and development of leadership, no missionary work can be considered successful. Missionary work, undertaken by non-Catholic denominations, has been highly successful, and we find strong, healthy colleges and universities for Negroes as a result of these efforts. The Negro in a country like ours has certain material advantages which during the last sixty years have made for rapid and permanent progress. Wherever this progress has been shown it has not failed to find staunch friends among the whites to help it on further. It is regrettable that in the Catholic sphere there has been no ensemble of Negro achievement marshaled in such a way as to appeal to Catholic philanthropy.

Practically all that has been achieved by the Catholic Negro group in a temporal way has been achieved from the Negro's

sheer tenacity in clinging to the band-wagon in the Protestant procession. We have been forced to the Protestant's colleges, to his Y.M.C.A.'s, and sometimes to his churches, because ours do not admit us; but we see a solution of the problem in a brighter day dawning. Greater efforts are being made to prepare a Negro clergy to do the brunt of missionary work among Negroes. Greater inclination is shown upon the part of our Catholic institutions of learning to remove the color bar which now prevents us, in many places, from getting an education under the auspices of the Church. With these two obstacles removed, the way will be paved for a much more rapid increase of Negroes in the Church.

Hampton, Va.

THOMAS W. TURNER, A.M., Ph.D.
Pres. Federated Colored Catholics of U. S.

Nikola Pashitch and Catholics

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The Serbian Concordat of 1914 with the Holy See never was effective, since the Government paid no attention whatever to the fulfilment of its implied obligations. After the War the extension of the Concordat to the whole kingdom was hampered by the Serbian Government asking competence in matters strictly religious and in internal ecclesiastical affairs. It is simply another instance of the spirit of Caesaro-Papism.

The Orthodoxy expressed by the Patriarch of Serbia reflects itself in Government activities. When the present Catholic Archbishop Rodic arrived in Belgrade to take possession of the See, the Patriarch's official organ greeted him as: *Hannibal ante portas*. The same organ recently fired this salvo: "We have overthrown the Apostolic Majesty and we will do the same with the Apostolic Curia."

"Croatia's chosen leader," Stepan Raditch, imposed upon it, was terror-stricken at the rule of Pashitch and imprisoned himself in his palace at Zagreb until found by the police, dragged out of his hiding-hole and jailed. To obtain freedom he broke his oath to free Croatia from the Serbian yoke, and offered to accept the present centralistic Constitution, to lead the Croatian people to the Old Catholic sect and then convert them finally to Orthodoxy. At the outset this sect was acknowledged by the Serbian Government as professing the religion of the State, like Orthodoxy, and was subsidized by the State. Pashitch's Government accepted Raditch's offer in writing and he was set at liberty by His Majesty, Alexander I.

Pashitch never believed in Yugoslavia, but in the centralized power of a Greater Serbia, with its capital in Belgrade. As Pashitch, so were the King and the rest of the Serbians. The aim of all is to Serbianize all Croats, Slovenes and Bulgars. Recent history proves it, Pashitch's life and works confirm it.

When on his way to be received in an audience by our present Holy Father, Premier Pashitch was approached by a gentleman of authority and asked about a Concordat with the kingdom, he answered: "If we do not get what we want, we will force it."

The Episcopate of Yugoslavia lodged many protests with the Government headed by Pashitch against uncalled-for persecutions and imprisonment of innocent Catholic priests, against intentional diversion in the budget of millions that should have gone to the Catholic Church but were turned over to others, against humiliating treatment of the Catholic Hierarchy in general, against persecution of the Greek Uniate Church in Bosnia and elsewhere, against the confiscation by the Government of the possessions of the Church's property, etc. But all protests were in vain.

These facts may throw new light on the Serbian situation.

Kansas City, Kans.

C. A. STIMAC.

Note by the Editor

Will the person who signed a Letter to the Editor "Frances O'Brien, Buffalo, N. Y." kindly communicate with Mr. Myles Connolly, Editor of *Columbia*, in view of an article for that periodical?